

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1873.

I.—EXCOMMUNICATION.

AS affecting the integrity, purity, and peace of the Church of God, her faithfulness to Christ, and her duty to her own membership, the question of Excommunication rises into grave importance. Viewed in the light of ecclesiastical history, as unfolding one of the awful secrets of the power wielded over the destinies of mankind by ecclesiastics—a dominion vastly more dreadful than that of the most powerful civil despots—it is a question not less interesting to the philosopher than to the theologian. For several reasons, which will suggest themselves as we proceed, it is a question of more than ordinary interest to the readers of the CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY at the present time.

Without pausing, at the outset, to inquire closely into Scriptural teaching on this subject, we may say that, apart from all direct teaching, the Church, in common with all associations, if it has a right to exist at all, has an inherent right of self-protection against unreasonable and wicked men, who may seek to subvert its aims or destroy its peace. But there are not wanting very clear intimations in the New Testament of the right and duty of self-protection, and consequently of separation from injurious persons. Many texts, however, which were designed to have no such general application, were soon pressed into the service by those who were anxious to wield ecclesiastical power; and a doctrine of excommunication soon grew into

unquestioned authority, of which, we think, but slight traces can be found in these Scriptures. Such are the texts which speak of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and of the power of binding and loosing. These passages, which evidently had a special reference to apostolical authority, have been held to apply to the Church; and as the Church soon came to mean practically those holding authority in the Church, the same power that Christ lodged with his ambassadors for special ends, was soon claimed by the priestly caste, as the successors to the apostles; and the power over heaven and hell—the power to admit to pardon, to open the gates of paradise, or to doom to everlasting torments—was believed to be lodged, in its awfulest amplitude, with a caste of frail, passionate, sinful mortals, by virtue of episcopal grace flowing in an unbroken channel from apostolic hands. Errors, like crimes, grow in clusters. A mistaken view of apostolical succession, of a priestly caste, and of sacramental efficacy, were suggested one by the other; any one of them logically implying the necessity or the fitness of the others, and all of them readily harmonizing with the superstitions which converts to Christianity were almost sure to bring with them, from the ritualism of the Jewish temple or that of Pagan religions. Once admit the necessity or the possibility of regeneration *ex opere operato*, and the consequent regenerative efficacy of baptism; then make the validity and consequent sacramental efficacy of this ordinance to depend on the administrator, lodging the power over the soul's destiny in human hands, and limiting the influx of spiritual life and blessedness to material and ritualistic channels which only a priest can command into operation,—there remains but one more step to complete the erection of a tremendous spiritual despotism; namely, to furnish the basis of priestly authority. This is given in the dogma of apostolical succession. Side by side these errors grew up, and ultimately developed into all the absurdities and enormities of excommunication, the confessional, absolution, purgatory, extreme unction, the primacy, the papacy, and finally the infallibility of the Pope—the last and worst fruit of the tree of human tradition.

The power to admit to salvation and to heaven, implies the power to expel from heaven and cast into hell. The saving power of the sacraments and of the priesthood once admitted, the power of excommunication not only from the Church, but from heaven itself, could

not be denied. With the growth and concentration of ecclesiastical authority, the significance of this doctrine increased, until, in the end, one man—and he perhaps false, cruel, licentious, and murderous—could unseal the vengeance of Heaven, and wield the thunderbolts of Divine wrath against individuals, communities, or nations, and doom all who were so unfortunate as to stand in his way, or provoke his anger, to everlasting ruin. At first, while the Church was yet feeble and persecuted, the terrors of excommunication were exclusively spiritual. The offender, subject first of all to the Lesser Excommunication, was cut off from the participation of the Eucharist, and shut out from the Communion-service, but still admitted to the Service of the Catechumens, and held within reach of entreaty and expostulation. If this did not succeed in winning him back, he was next subjected to the Greater Excommunication, by which he was cut off from all participation in religious services, and so completely segregated from the company of believers as to exclude him from all recognition in social relations and in the common affairs of life. "He was a pariah, cut off from human society; and though, during the earlier times, when the Christians were few and scattered, this might have been but a light infliction on the carnal and worldly minded, yet as the religionists multiplied, it became more and more severe; and when paganism was finally overthrown, it was the destruction of the victim's life and prospects. In this world the Church ruined his career and excluded him from the company of men, as in the next it ejected him from that of angels; so that life here and hereafter was equally within its control."* When Church and State were united, and civil as well as spiritual penalties were visited on the recalcitrant, excommunication grew into an enormous power of vengeance and oppression, and became an engine of terror which caused even the proudest monarchs to tremble for their thrones. The offender was not only cut off from spiritual and social privileges, but from civil rights. Even penitents, until fully restored, could not prosecute or appear as witnesses, could not marry, and if married, were denied the rights of marriage; while the impenitent were utterly ostracised during life—every one being liable to excommunication who should extend

*Lea's "Studies in Church History," page 241. The reader will find in this excellent work a very satisfactory *résumé* of the testimonies of ecclesiastical history on the subject of Excommunication.

to him the hospitality of food, fire, water, or shelter—and refused burial when dead. More than this, the vengeance of the Church pursued the dead into the realms of the invisible. Men were excommunicated even centuries after their death. Thus Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, excommunicated Origen after the latter had been in his grave for two centuries. It is true, this tremendous power, being so liable to abuse, and being actually abused to a fearful extent, was made subject to limitations; and even among ecclesiastical oppressors there was left enough sense of justice to grant what many who profess to love the benevolence and justice of the New Testament so stoutly deny—the right of appeal; but even this lost its value as Papal authority grew into an overshadowing dominion, and the thunders of the Vatican silenced all inferior voices. Then, again, the tragedy of excommunication oftentimes degenerated into farce; and, with the loss of its dignity, it lost much of its terror, until multitudes came to despise and condemn it; for it had been found so convenient and so potent a means of quelling opposition, that ecclesiastics, when sorely pressed, did not hesitate to use it against each other. Thus we have bishop excommunicating bishop; the bishop of one province excommunicating the Churches of another province; one patriarch excommunicating another patriarch, and being paid back in kind; and even Pope excommunicating Pope,—until the gravity of the proceeding is lost in its ridiculousness, and the world laughs at that which once made it tremble.

Our limits will not allow of more than an outline of the theory and practice of excommunication, as taught and practiced by the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps the *animus* of the Church, in her proceedings against offenders, and the extent and character of her claims in this particular, may be most satisfactorily apprehended, in the concrete, in the anathemas pronounced against recalcitrants.

Read the following, pronounced about the year 1014, by Benedict VIII, against some vassals of William II, Count of Provence, who were endeavoring to obtain from the latter the grant of certain lands, claimed by the Monastery of St. Giles.

After employing the general terms of excommunication, in delivering the offenders to Satan, the Pope proceeds:

“Let them be accursed in their bodies; and let their souls be delivered to destruction and perdition and torture. Let them be damned with the damned;

let them be scourged with the ungrateful; let them perish with the proud. Let them be accursed with the Jews, who, seeing the incarnate Christ, did not believe, but sought to crucify him. Let them be accursed with the heretics who sought to destroy the Church. Let them be accursed with those who blasphemed the name of God. Let them be accursed with those who despair of the mercy of God. Let them be accursed with those who lie damned in hell. Let them be accursed with the impious and sinners, unless they amend their ways, and confess themselves in fault toward St. Giles. Let them be accursed in the four quarters of the earth. In the East be they accursed, and in the West disinherited; in the North interdicted, and in the South excommunicate. Be they accursed in the day-time, and excommunicate in the night-time. Accursed be they at home, and excommunicate abroad; accursed in standing, and excommunicate in sitting; accursed in eating, accursed in drinking, accursed in sleeping, and excommunicate in waking; accursed when they work, and excommunicate when they rest. Let them be accursed in the Spring-time, and excommunicate in the Summer; accursed in the Autumn, and excommunicate in the Winter. Let them be accursed in this world, and excommunicate in the next. Let their lands pass into the hands of the stranger, their wives be given over to perdition, and their children fall before the edge of the sword. Let what they eat be accursed, and accursed be what they leave, so that he who eats it shall be accursed. Accursed and excommunicate be the priest who shall give them the body and blood of the Lord, or who shall visit them in sickness. Accursed and excommunicate be he who shall carry them to the grave, and shall dare to bury them. Let them be excommunicate and accursed with all curses, if they do not make amends and render due satisfaction."

There is a high revel of curses here, enough to make fiends jealous of their honors; an eloquence in damning, an exquisite minuteness of exultant curses, and a generous expenditure of anathemas even upon the innocent wives and children of the offenders, which shows a rich exuberance of revengefulness in the spiritual treasury of this successor of the apostles. If a successor at all, we opine his descent is to be traced back to James or John, at that period when they wished to call down fire from heaven upon their enemies, and the blessed Master said to them, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Or, perhaps, as all this rage is about the property of the Church, it may be Judas Iscariot's careful economy that speaks in these terrific curses! It is said that even Peter, at one time, cursed and swore bitterly. We fear, if the Popes be his successors, that they have received the spirit of Satan, which then possessed him.

Still a daring attempt to seize the *property* of the Church may, perhaps, justify an unusual eloquence of malediction, and we must not judge this Pope too severely. But what shall we say to the following

form of malediction, pronounced even against petty thieves, and sinners of the smaller sort?

"By the authority of God, the Omnipotent Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the sacred canons, and of the holy and unsullied Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and of all the heavenly virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominations, powers, cherubim, and seraphim, and of the holy patriarchs, prophets, and all the apostles and evangelists, and of the holy Innocents, who alone are worthy in the sight of the Lamb to sing the new song, and of the holy martyrs, and the holy confessors, and the holy virgins, and of all the saints and elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize this thief, or this malefactor; and we expel him from the holy Church of God, that he may be delivered over to eternal torment with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who cried to the Lord God, 'Away from us, we wish not to know thy ways.' And as fire is quenched with water, so may his light be quenched forever and ever, unless he repent and render full satisfaction. Amen. Be he accursed of God, the Father, who created man; accursed of God, the Son, who suffered for man; accursed of the Holy Ghost, which cometh in baptism; accursed of the Holy Cross, which the triumphant Christ ascended for our salvation; accursed of the holy Virgin Mary, the Mother of God; accursed of St. Michael, the receiver of blessed souls; accursed of the angels and archangels, the princes and powers, and all the hosts of heaven; accursed of the worthy legion of prophets and patriarchs; accursed of St. John, the forerunner and baptizer of Christ; accursed of St. Peter and St. Paul and St. Andrew, and all the apostles of Christ, and the other disciples, and the four evangelists, who converted the world; accursed of the wonder-working band of martyrs and confessors, whose good works have been pleasing to God; accursed of all the holy virgins, who have shunned the world for the love of Christ; accursed of all the saints, beloved of God, from the beginning even unto the end of the world; accursed of heaven and of earth, and of all that is holy therein. Let him be accursed wherever he be; whether at home or abroad, in the road or in the path, or in the wood, or in the water, or in the Church. Let him be accursed living and dying, eating, drinking, fasting, or athirst, slumbering, sleeping, waking, walking, standing, sitting, lying, working, idling, ———, ———, and bleeding. Let him be accursed in all the forces of his body. Let him be accursed outside and inside; accursed in his hair, and accursed in his brain; accursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his brows, in his eyes, in his cheeks, in his jaws, in his nostrils, in his front teeth, in his back teeth, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his upper arms, in his lower arms, in his hands, in his fingers, in his breast, in his heart, in his stomach and liver, in his kidneys, in his loins, in his hips, in his ———, in his thighs, in his knees, in his shins, in his feet, in his toes, and in his nails. Let him be accursed in every joint of his body. Let there be no health in him from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot. May Christ, the Son of the Living God, curse him throughout his kingdom; and may Heaven, with all its virtues, rise up against him to his damnation, unless he repent, and render due satisfaction. Amen. So be it. So be it. Amen!"

If a man were allowed to follow cursing as a trade, for a thousand years, it is difficult to believe he could much improve on this masterpiece of malediction. As expressive of the spirit then reigning in

the Church, and as suggestive of the spell of terror under which the ignorant and superstitious must have been held by the bishops and priests, it is worthy of study.

We are aware that the genuineness of this formula of excommunication has been disputed. When Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Bishop Purcell, in 1837, produced a copy of it, as having been used against a refractory priest in Philadelphia, the bishop declared they were "not Catholic curses, nor yet Protestant curses exactly, but the *jeu d'esprit* of a Protestant minister, Laurence Sterne; all found in this book," said he, "which I have had brought me this moment from a book-store, written by that worthy parson himself, and one of the most grossly obscene in the English language." But this statement was cunningly made in the *last* speech of the debate, when there was no opportunity for reply. Mr. Campbell read the excommunication in the speech *before* his last, but there was no response. Then, in the last speech of the bishop, which closed the debate, and, consequently, when no reply could be made to his assertions, he disposed of it as we have stated. Now, it is true that Sterne, in "Tristram Shandy," does give this terrific accumulation of curses, and adroitly and humorously weaves them into his story. But it is *not* true that Sterne invented them. The keen humorist made his story the vehicle of terrible satire against many errors and abuses; and, among the rest, he hits off the ecclesiastical assumptions of Romanism; but, while he makes his humor and wit the *vehicle*, the *materials* on which his wit feeds is not fiction, but fact. If Bishop Purcell was sincere in his statement, it only shows that he was more familiar with "one of the most grossly obscene books in the English language" than with the ecclesiastical documents which it concerned him to know and understand. Lea quotes it from Baluz. II, 469-70, and states that Sterne probably obtained it from Spelman. (Glossar. s. v. Excommunication.) It stands not alone. There are other formulas of excommunication, both in the Latin and Greek Churches, breathing the same spirit.

To such an extent did superstition succeed in fastening the terrors of excommunication on the people, that, according to the "False Decretals," even when groundless, it was to be held in reverence as valid, and Popes sometimes granted, as a *special privilege*, the right not to be excommunicated without cause! If it is possible to go

farther in superstitious enslavement to priestly authority, the last extreme will be found in the *excommunication of lands and animals*; territories being placed under interdict; and caterpillars, rats, snails, pigeons, ants, etc., being anathematized from the pulpit, with the same formula used in the excommunication of priests!

When we come to the Protestant Churches, while we find sufficiently severe denunciation of Roman Catholic excommunications—and it is well known how Luther and his compeers derided them—we still see the same root-idea of “the power of the Keys” as belonging to the Church or to the clergy; and wherever Protestantism allied itself with the State, we discover this same power of excommunication employed as a means of terrifying the superstitious, subjugating the rebellious, and advancing the dominion of the clergy. Lutherans and Calvinists, and the adherents of the Church of England, all, with more or less distinctness, asserted the power and the terrors of excommunication, making it a consignment of its subjects to eternal damnation, and, wherever the State would authorize it, bringing them under civil disabilities, and visiting upon them temporal penalties, which became exceedingly oppressive, and raised many an outcry to the civil authorities against the spiritual persecutors. The Kirk-sessions of Scotland, and the similar Church authorities of Geneva, were often as intolerant and oppressive as the priests and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, and had not the excuse, which the latter could often plead, of the necessities of the times—the masses of rude barbarians being incapable of subjection except through superstitious terrors. The Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission of the Church of England have a history of ecclesiastical assumptions and oppressions as odious and as damning as those of Romish ecclesiastical courts. It was not excommunication, nor its consequences, that Protestants really objected to, only that they were the subjects of its vengeance. When they could wield the power against others, it was all right. It is true that the fundamental principles of Protestantism are in opposition to a priestly caste, and to all claims of control over the conscience. It is also true that the progress in general knowledge in Protestant countries, and the multiplicity of sects, have largely prevented any very powerful or extended system of ecclesiastical oppression from coming into existence. It is to be said, also, that the spirit of the age is in

opposition to assumptions of exclusive priestly prerogatives on the part of the clergy; that all ecclesiastical caste is losing its sacredness, and that man, as man, is rising into greater dignity; so that we no longer fear the exercise of any extravagant or dreaded power in excommunication, so far as Protestants are concerned, and laugh at it when it is claimed or asserted by Roman Catholics. Nevertheless, the dregs of old superstitions on this question are in all the Churches to-day, and questions of discipline are often embarrassed by the lingering shadows of that old doctrine of the power of the Keys. It is not uncommon, even now, for a congregation, having by a mere majority of those present—and an actual minority of the entire membership of the Church—decided on excommunicating certain persons, to deliver them over to Satan! Sometimes, too, this is done by the eldership, without the least regard to the will of the congregation. And when, in such cases, injustice is complained of, and respectable parties, hitherto of spotless name, or even influential members of neighboring Churches who fear that injustice has been done, ask for a reference of the case to a more competent or less partial tribunal, they are met with a stubborn refusal, on the ground that the Church—the highest spiritual court on earth—has decided the question; and that, according to the Scriptures, what the Church binds on earth is bound in heaven! We propose, therefore, to institute an inquiry into the teaching of the New Testament on this question.

There can be no question that the power of the Keys—the power to bind and loose, to permit and forbid—was, in the first instance, imparted to a single individual. (Matt. xvi, 18, 19.) The most liberal interpretation possible, in the light of other Scriptures, will not allow this to be extended beyond the apostles. Whether we apply the phrases *bind* and *loose* to forgiving and retaining sins, in harmony with John xx, 22, 23; or to pronouncing authoritatively on the conditions of eternal life; or to establishing the government of the Church,—in any case, it is a power which belonged to the apostles by special appointment, and in view of a Divine endowment of wisdom and power to that end. The same reason that leads us to confide in them as authoritatively announcing salvation and its conditions—namely, their possession of the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth—will lead us to accept whatever they have ordained, and to

eschew whatever they have prohibited ; for they but express, with infallible certainty, the Divine will ; and, therefore, whatever they have bound on earth is bound in heaven, and whatever they have loosed on earth is loosed in heaven. But this can not be said of the Church, nor of any Church officials, because to them no such Divine gift is imparted. Nor is it anywhere asserted that what the Church binds on earth is bound in heaven. The text relied on to establish this absurd and mischievous doctrine (Matt. xviii, 18) certainly teaches nothing of the kind. Our Lord, in this connection, speaks once *of* the Church, but not at all *to* the Church. The Church of Christ had, as yet, no existence ; he could not, therefore, speak *to* it. But he is speaking *to* certain persons when he says, "Verily I say unto *you*, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc. "Again I say unto *you*, That if two of *you* shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven." (Ver. 19.) Now, the persons present to whom he addressed himself were the twelve apostles. Compare Matt. xviii, 1, Mark ix, 33, and Luke ix, 46. We may safely regard this, therefore, as an amplification of the promise made previously to Peter, making the power of the Keys—the power to open and shut, to bind and loose—the common inheritance of all the apostles. If any other application of the language is attempted, it must be made, not to the Church, but to the individual Christian in dealing with his brother according to the directions given in verses 15–17 ; for no action of the Church is contemplated in this text beyond that of seeking to prevail with the sinning one to listen to the plea of him against whom he has sinned. No act of excommunication is spoken of or hinted at, so far as the Church is concerned. Indeed, this whole connection is burdened with one thought—kindness, forbearance, and gentleness to the erring. The matter of Church discipline, as usually understood, is not in the horizon of this discourse. Our Lord had been speaking of the great wrong done to even the humblest believer by causing him to stumble ; that as He came to save that which was lost, so should his disciples act in the same spirit and labor to the same end. As the shepherd would leave ninety-nine sheep safely folded, and go into the mountains to seek one that had strayed, and rejoice more, when he found it, over that recovered one than over the ninety-nine that had not strayed ; so should his disciples seek to win

the erring and save the lost. The theme is, *bringing wanderers into the fold*—not casting out those that are in—and tenderly dealing with such as are in danger of straying. In this light, let the reader carefully consider verses 15-17: "Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee," instead of seeking to drag him to justice or expose him to scorn, or leaving him to go on in sin to his own ruin, "go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, *thou hast gained thy brother*." That is the end sought; not personal satisfaction, not self-vindication, but *the recovery of the erring one*. "But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. *And if he shall neglect to hear them*"—it is not the object, then, of these witnesses, to catch the words and watch the motions of the offender, with a view to testify against him and secure his expulsion from the Church, but to witness the efforts of the person sinned against to reclaim his erring brother, and to join him in the effort to win him back—"tell it unto the Church"—not in the shape of charges against him with a view to bring him to justice, but as one who seeks his salvation, entreating the Church to join its influence with his and with that of the two or three already mentioned, so that he may be, if possible, persuaded to abandon his sin. "And if he shall neglect to hear the Church"—if this last step proves unavailing, you are released from all further obligation; it is vain to attempt any thing farther; let him go—"let him be unto *thee* as a heathen man and a publican"—that is, as a heathen or a publican is to a Jew, so let him be to thee; seek no farther intercourse with him, but pass him by. What a heathen was to a Jew may be learned from Acts x, 28: "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." What the Church shall do with him, if any thing, is not said here; the text treats only of the duty of the individual. It is vain, therefore, to look here for authority for the Church to bind and loose. Origen, Theophylact, Chrysostom, and Austin, all make application of this language to the individual Christian in seeking the recovery of his brother from sin. But the awful import of the words themselves, the fact that they were addressed to the apostles, and a comparison of them with Matt. xvi, 19, go to show that they describe a power lodged with the inspired apostles, and with them alone.

In deciding the question as to the power of a Church in excommunicating members, regard should be had to the extent of her power in receiving them. She can not take away more than she gave. What, then, is the extent of the power of the Church in receiving members? Can she forgive sins? Is it hers to open the gates of the kingdom, or to close them? Can she forbid salvation to any, or confer it on whom she pleases? We answer most emphatically, No. Since the apostles have opened the gates of salvation, and revealed what is permitted and what is forbidden, no ecclesiastical power can change it. The Church may attempt to establish other doctrines and commandments, but what the apostles ordained remains true in spite of her action. She may fail to conform to their teaching, but it remains true in spite of her unfaithfulness. She may repeat what they have said, and do what they have enjoined—it is well; but it is not more bound or loosed in heaven on account of her binding or loosing; not one whit. *Salvation is a matter between the individual soul and its Savior.* If the sinner believes, repents, and obeys, he is saved, whether the Church says so or not. If he does not believe, repent, and obey, the Church in vain pronounces him in a saved state. What folly, then, to talk of the Church binding and loosing! Not even in the matter of baptism is the sinner's salvation dependent on the Church. True, if the Church is true to her mission, sinners generally will be led to faith, repentance, and obedience by her ministrations. But if the sinner is led to faith and repentance by any other ministration, the result, so far as salvation is concerned, is the same; and if baptism be administered without the Church's authority or instrumentality, provided the subject is a true believer in Christ, its blessings are sure to him from God; while a thousand baptisms, administered by a direct descendant of the apostles, on whose head had flowed the full measure of episcopal grace through an unbroken channel, could have no possible avail in conveying any spiritual blessing, if the subject did not in his heart believe and repent. Why, then, talk about the power of the Church to bind and loose? Will it be said that the Church binds and looses by declaring the authorized terms of salvation and administering baptism for remission of sins? We answer, The terms of salvation are true and fixed, whether the Church declares them or not; and as to baptism, its validity is nowhere in Scripture made to depend on the ecclesiastical standing

of the administrator. As a question of *order*, that consideration is of importance; as affecting the salvation of the subject, it has no importance whatever. So far as membership in her society is concerned, the blessings of brotherhood and the advantages of spiritual culture, that far the action of the Church can decide, and no further. Whether any thing that she binds on earth is bound in heaven or not, be it ever so Scriptural, rests not with her, but with the person whom she receives or rejects. If he is right before God, no action of hers can disturb his relations with the Father of spirits; if he is wrong, no action of hers, be it ever so Scripturally exact, can avail, since her administrations are external, and have no control of the motives of the heart.

If, then, in the admission of members, the power of the Church is thus limited, what can she take away that she did not impart? Why talk of her power of binding and loosing in the matter of excommunication? Will any one claim for the Church infallibility in her judgments? If not, then if she unrighteously condemn and exclude any, will her unrighteous act be approved in heaven? Or if it be merely an error of judgment by which she condemns the innocent, will what she binds on earth be bound in heaven? Surely, none will answer in the affirmative.

But, it is argued, when she proceeds righteously, and excludes offenders according to the will of God, *then* what the Church binds on earth is bound in heaven. That is all that is claimed for the action of the Church. We answer, *It is bound in heaven whether the Church binds it on earth or not.* If an offender deserves excommunication, he is cut off from heavenly fellowship, whether the Church excludes him or not. His own sins have separated him from God and from the hope of heaven. Is any one foolish enough to suppose that as long as the Church holds on to him, Heaven must necessarily hold on to him? or that when the Church lets him go, Heaven is bound to let him go? No, no; we are ten thousand times thankful that Heaven has not thus left our destiny at the mercy of frail, erring mortals or to the caprice of mutable, fallible, and sometimes wicked men. Heaven has bound, and none can loose; Heaven has loosed, and none can bind; thank God! The Church has never been wise enough or holy enough to be intrusted with such an absolute power over human destiny—never has been, is not now, and

never will be. We are aware—and we are happy in the assurance—that we are striking at the deepest root of ecclesiastical tyranny, when we strike at this power of the Keys. Take away this figment, and its adjuncts of sacramental regeneration and priestly caste, and the entire fabric of ecclesiastical assumption tumbles into ruin.

What, then, is the extent of the power in the hands of the Church touching excommunication? We have already said that any society which has a right to exist at all, has an inherent right of self-protection and self-preservation; and may, therefore, when her own preservation or a wise conservation of her interests requires it, rid herself of injurious persons. We believe, and shall attempt to prove, that the New Testament teaches this to be the duty as well as the right of the Church. When it is done, the Church simply takes away what she gave—formal membership and its attendant privileges and honors, whatever they may be. Her judgment can only extend to overt acts, and her punitive measures can only reach external and formal relationships. Even this, we are satisfied, is not encouraged in New Testament teaching, except in extreme cases.

Right here, let us say that the true character of the membership of the New Testament Church seems to us to be not generally understood. A class of texts which treats of them as saints, as washed, sanctified, and justified, as children of light, etc., is pressed as if these were exact descriptions of the actual Church. They describe the *ideal* Church, not the Church as it actually was in apostolic times, or as it has ever been since. Read the introduction to the first Epistle to the Corinthians. What a conception it affords us of the Church in that city! It is "the Church of God;" its members are "sanctified in Christ Jesus," and "called to be saints." They had been "called by God unto the fellowship of his Son." The grace of God had enriched them so that they "came behind in no gift." They were "waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," and Paul expresses confidence that the Lord "will confirm them unto the end, that they might be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." But when we come to learn their actual character and spiritual condition, how painfully low does the actual fall from the *ideal* Church! Strifes, factions, carnalities, and gross immoralities abound. The language of Paul, in the introduction, describes the *ideal* Church—

what they professed to be; what God would have them be; what they were, perhaps, in the germ; but, as yet, only in the germ. The Church is composed of saints—saints by profession, saints in intention, saints in rank, but very imperfect saints in character. Had it been the intention to establish a community exclusively or mainly made up of the actually holy, there would undoubtedly have been two arrangements altogether different from what we find. First, there would have been much more rigid tests of admission to membership; and, secondly, there would have been much more ample and definite teaching concerning excommunication. The fact that even the worst of sinners are to be admitted on a credible profession of faith and repentance, joined to the fact that excommunication is not encouraged except in extreme cases, forbids the idea of a community of actually holy ones. The Church is at best a school in which to *learn* holiness. It will be slowly learned, and progress will be marred by many blunders; yea, by many sins. That they are to *pursue* holiness is the great lesson; but as reasonably look in an infant school, or in the preparatory school of a college, or in all the college classes, for thoroughly educated pupils, as look in the Church for complete saints. A few may be found in their senior year, about ready to graduate, and these will soon be taken away from the college to the grand activities of the more perfect spiritual life above; the rest are only learners, some much more advanced than others, but all in process of education. It was never intended that the Church should be made up of good people; at best it is composed of those who *desire* and *aim* to be good and holy, and among them it is contemplated that many will be found whose aim, even, is in doubt. Notwithstanding all that has been said on the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, to divert its teaching into another channel, we are still constrained to regard it as pregnant with this lesson: that the kingdom of heaven, in the sense of the Church, must necessarily have in it bad as well as good; that to decide authoritatively between these is not the province of mortals; and that it is better to allow the tares to remain, than, by too zealous attempts to root them out, to injure the wheat as well. "The field is *the world*," we are told; not the *Church*. Very good. But the *field* (the world) is not the *kingdom*. The field is the *territory* in which this kingdom has an existence, and the kingdom is *in* the world, but is not the world; and

the wheat and tares are both found *in the kingdom*. See also the Parable of the Drag-net. (Matt. xiii, 47-49.) The net that gathers the fishes *out of* the sea, "gathered of every kind;" and the separation between the good and bad does not take place until "the end of the world." These parables do not prove that discipline is never to be exercised in the Church, or that the positively bad are never to be cast out; they would then fail to harmonize with other Scripture lessons. But they do teach that the character of the membership of a Church is necessarily mixed; that it is beyond the power of any earthly discipline to make the Church actually pure; that any attempt to reach that end by excommunication will end in casting out many of Christ's own; and that, in many cases, it is better to bear with the evil than by an over-scrupulousness of discipline to imperil the interests of the good. When we thus reach just conceptions of the necessary mixture of good and evil in the Church, it will modify our views as to the propriety or necessity of excommunication in many cases.

Let us now look briefly at the methods of dealing with offenders, suggested in the Scriptures. We, of course, suppose it to be understood by the reader, that public teaching, admonition, exhortation, and deprecation, are continually asserting their power to condemn the evil and encourage the good. We design to speak only of special methods.

1. We have already seen that, in case of a person sinned against, the steps are marked out by which he is to seek to recover his erring brother, and the limits fixed, beyond which he has no responsibility. Similar private and personal labors for the recovery of any erring ones, even if we are not personally concerned in their wrongdoing, are enjoined in other texts. "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye who are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." (Gal. vi, 1.) "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he who converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." (Jas. v, 19, 20.) These texts do not contemplate *official* action; they point out what every Christian is bound to do for his erring brother, to recover him from the snares of Satan. Of course, it is the duty of Church officers to perform this duty; but it is a duty

not confined to them. It is always in order to endeavor to save a soul from death.

2. *Rebuke.* This is, perhaps, implied as the duty of the Church (Matt. xviii, 17) in regard to persons brought before her, for a last effort to recover them. It is especially enjoined in 1 Tim. v, 20: "Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may fear." The solemn charge accompanying this (ver. 21), shows what importance Paul attached to it as a wholesome means of discipline. The object is, that the transgressor may be led to fear, and that "others also may fear." The power of a public reprimand, given in a proper spirit, upon those not lost to shame, is great. Entirely too little attention is given to this as a means of reformation to the offender, and as a powerful restraint on others who are in danger of sinning. It is not a general rebuke from the pulpit, addressed to the hearers at large, but a special reprimand, given in the presence of the whole Church, to the offender personally, in which his particular sin is dealt with, and such lessons suggested as the peculiarities of the case demand.

3. *Social Ostracism.* This is suggested in several Epistles. "Now I beseech you, brethren, *mark* them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; *and avoid them.* For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. (Rom. xvi, 17, 18.) Here are dangerous persons whom we, with our rigid notions of discipline inherited from Churches that rejoiced in "the power of the Keys," would not hesitate to cast out of the Church. Yet Paul says only, "*Avoid them.*" Associate not with them. Show them no confidence. Lend them no countenance. This silent assertion of an offended public sentiment, placing the evil-disposed under social ban, has immense power. It has the advantage of avoiding all strife, all pretext for schism, as no coercive measures are attempted against them. They are left to wilt and wither under a silent but perpetual and pervading sentiment of virtuous indignation, which asserts itself in a social ostracism which none but the utterly reprobate can disregard. It strikes at them just where they are most intent on pursuing their mischievous designs—in the social circle, in personal intercourse with the members of the Church. Silently the doors are closed against them, and they are left to consort with their own.

Similarly Paul instructs Titus: "A heretic [factionist], after the first and second admonitions, *avoid*." This is Alford's rendering, and this is the proper force of *παραιτέομαι*. It does not, therefore, relate to excommunication.

So, also, Timothy is exhorted in regard to certain evil characters; or, rather, the Church of after-times is exhorted through Timothy; for the text speaks of characters to arise in "the last days;" "from such turn away." (2 Tim. iii, 5.)

More detailed directions are given in 1 Cor. v, 9-11. Paul had written to the Corinthians, in a former letter, not to company with fornicators. He now explains his meaning to have been, that "*if any man, called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.*" That this does not refer to the Lord's-supper, is evident, because the kind of association which he forbade them to have with this class *in* the Church, he allowed them to have with wicked men *out* of the Church. They could associate and eat with men of this world, even if they were wicked men. Hence (chap. x, 27) he allows Christians to go to a feast made by an unbeliever, if they were so disposed. But with those called *brethren*, who were guilty of such sins as are mentioned, they were not so much as to eat. There is no excommunication here, but segregation, supported not by Church action, but by the general virtuous sentiment of the membership.

Similar instructions are given to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. iii, 14): "If any man obey not our word by this Epistle, *note* that man, and *have no company with him*, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but *admonish him as a brother*." Here is no excommunication. He is still recognized and admonished *as a brother*; but they are not to associate with him, nor to allow him a place in social fellowship among those whom they recognize as worthy of confidence and respect. This explains the meaning of verse 6: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye *withdraw yourselves* from every brother that walketh disorderly."

We have quoted enough passages from the Epistles to show that great reliance was placed on this *social ban* as a means of reproof and bringing to repentance the refractory. In almost all cases where we resort to excommunication, the apostolical Churches were

instructed simply to keep no company with offenders, yet to admonish them as brethren. Indeed, we have entirely reversed the apostolical rule. Then the Churches did not ordinarily excommunicate offenders, but placed them under social ban, refusing even to eat with them; now we ordinarily excommunicate them, but allow them the same social position as before.

There is left but one case of importance to be considered: that of the incestuous person at Corinth. (1 Cor. v, 1-7.) We quote from Alford's revision: "It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even named among the Gentiles, so that one [of you] hath his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and did not rather mourn, that he that did this deed might be removed from among you. For I verily, being absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, according as ye are unleavened." After a digression from the case of this great offender to the proper treatment of other offenders, he returns to the subject (ver. 13): "Put away from among yourselves the wicked man." We are aware that the text is not without its difficulties. There are, however, certain things which appear to us to be plainly declared.

1. Paul's judgment was, that the Church in Corinth should deliver this offender to Satan.

2. They should do it when gathered together; it was, therefore, to be the action of the Church.

3. They were to do it in the name of the Lord Jesus—by Divine authority.

4. His Spirit would be present with them when they did it; it would have his apostolical authority, as if he were personally present with them.

5. The power of the Lord Jesus would be present with them.

To "deliver unto Satan" can not mean less than excommunication. It may mean more; that is, it may import the visitation of

some special punishment as the result of an apostolic sentence and the presence of the power of the Lord Jesus; a punishment to be attendant on his expulsion from the Church. The same power that struck Ananias and Sapphira with death, might be exercised in the infliction of a special judgment designed to humble the criminal and bring him to repentance. But we see no reason to resort to such an interpretation. The entrance of a believer into the Church is contemplated in the Scriptures as a deliverance from the power of darkness and a translation unto the kingdom of Christ. (Col. i, 13.) Conversion is turning the sinner from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that he may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among the sanctified. (Acts xxvi, 18.) To turn him back whence he came, therefore, is to deliver him over to Satan. It needs no introduction of miraculous power to give meaning or dignity to the phrase "deliver over to Satan." This accords with what is said in verse 13: "Put away from among you the wicked man." If it is insisted, however, that the phrase implies the miraculous, then we reply that it will have to be shown that this was *commanded* to be done. It stands as a record of what Paul had in his own mind determined on, or as that which he was minded to do, but not as a commandment to the Church at Corinth; and it remains to be proved that it was ever done. What he did plainly command was, "Put away from among you the wicked man." This they did, as is evident from 2 Cor. ii, 1-11. This they ought to have done without waiting for instructions. Paul chides them that they had not mourned over this disgrace, so as to be impelled to remove the wicked one from among them. We have here, therefore, a clear instance of excommunication by apostolic authority.

Concerning this case we learn the following particulars:

(1.) It was a most heinous and disgraceful crime that had been committed—such a crime as even in the licentious city of Corinth, with its very low tone of morals, was a horror even to the heathens.

(2.) It was still persisted in.

(3.) There was no doubt about it. It was not denied. The offender did not attempt to deny it, and there was no room for doubt or for controversy as to the fact.

(4.) The fact of its being allowed without rebuke was demoralizing the Church, and exposing the cause of Christ to dishonor before

the world. It really became a question of self-preservation and self-protection from the worst of injuries.

(5.) There was not the slightest hope of reformation, except by extreme measures.

Under such circumstances, the apostle insists on excommunication as necessary for the Church's spiritual safety, and as the only hope of reforming the criminal. That it resulted in bringing him to repentance, is proof of the salutary power of righteous excommunication. We conclude, therefore, that where a sin has been committed which shocks the moral sense of the community, forbearance with which will demoralize the Church and disgrace her in the eyes of the world; which clearly indicates that the offender is lost to all sense of shame and to all regard for the Church; a sin, moreover, concerning which there is no doubt, and in regard to which the extremest severity can do no wrong,—the guilty one should be put away from among the people of God. This should be done, however, not revengefully nor resentfully, but in the hope and with the prayer that the solemn excision may result in the destruction of the flesh and the salvation of the spirit.

Such cases, however, will be found to be comparatively rare. From all the premises submitted, we reach the following conclusions:

a. Excommunication is an extreme measure, only to be employed when all other means have failed, and when the longer continuance of the wrong-doer in the Church would be an injustice to the Church and an unfaithfulness to him.

b. In a large number of cases in which resort is usually had to excommunication, it would be more apostolic to rely on public rebuke and social ostracism.

c. It is not possible, by any human judgment, to keep the Church pure; nor was it meant to be so. As long as it is possible, therefore, to do any good to the erring one, it is better to avoid this last resort, and endeavor, by other means, to save him. The character of the Church need not suffer so long as it is known that she mourns over the wrong, and seeks the recovery of the wrong-doer.

d. Wherever there is doubt as to the guilt of the accused, or whenever, the guilt being admitted, there is danger, by severe measures, of producing among worthy members of the Church dissatisfaction and alienation, it is better to let the wheat and tares grow

together. There are many doubtful and perplexing cases which must be referred to the final judgment for decision. There are many cases of casuistry ; and there are many things which we may esteem foolish and reprehensible, but which are not crimes, which we may condemn and advise against, and in opposition to which we may array the moral sentiment of the Church, which we can not justly make a ground of excommunication. There is too much of mere opinion and inference in our best judgment to warrant the employment of extreme measures ; and the responsibility is too great, in such cases, to be assumed by erring mortals.

e. In any case of doubt or of difficulty, excommunication by a majority vote is perilous, and ought not to be resorted to. When the Corinthians acted by a majority, it was simply in executing a sentence passed by an apostle. It was a case of no doubt. The minority, if any active minority there were—which is very doubtful—were simply reckless as to apostolical authority.

f. The ruling spirit of the Church of Christ is not that of judicial severity, but of love ; a love that bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things, and never fails. To bless, and not to curse, is the ruling sentiment of every truly Christian heart. It is only when we are sure that love has exhausted every art, and that love itself would degenerate into unholiness if longer forbearance were exercised, that excommunication should be resorted to.

We wish to touch on another phase of this question before we close. Much has been written on the question of Appeal or Reference, in cases of excommunication where injustice is complained of. We suggest that an important question lies back of this. Were excommunications as rare with us as they were in apostolic times, would this controversy about appeals ever have arisen ? Is not the real remedy to be sought rather in a more careful adherence to apostolic teaching as to the treatment of offenders ? Have not most of the troubles which call out appeals been such as, in the apostolical Churches, would have been managed without excommunication ? We are decidedly of this opinion ; and we ask for a renewed study of the New Testament on this point. A reference of serious troubles *before excommunication takes place*, would heal, perhaps, nine-tenths of the dissatisfactions which harsh measures only aggravate.

When a Church proceeds to excommunication, her action should

be respected by all sister Churches. The presumption is that she has done right, and her action is entitled to respect until there is good reason to doubt its justness. Disciplinary action is a farce if it is not to be respected as far as sisterhood with the Church that performs it extends. This is so plain a lesson in morals that it looks like an insult to the understanding of the reader to attempt to prove it. But for the same reason that other Churches are bound to respect her action, she is bound to respect their inquiries and their counsels, if they are led to believe her action to be such as they can not approve. This is as plain and clear as the other. If she will not listen to their inquiries and counsels, she has no right to ask them to respect her action. An independence that claims every thing and yields nothing, is too near akin to Papal infallibility in arrogant assumption to command the respect or sympathy of free and intelligent Christians. But let us learn a closer conformity to New Testament teaching on the question of discipline, and we shall hear little of appeal; the necessity for it will no longer exist.

II.—THE DOWNFALL OF THE SECULAR PAPACY.

THE object of this paper is threefold: to give a succinct history of the loss of the Pope's Temporal Power; to inquire whether it is likely to be restored; and to consider the bearing of its loss on the Spiritual Papacy. To gain the proper point of departure, it will be necessary to go back to the beginning of the present Pontiff's pontificate.

Pope Gregory XVI died on the 1st of June, 1846. His reign had been long and troubled. The fires lit up by the French Revolution, though buried under the settlement of 1815, were struggling to find vent, and nowhere more fiercely than in Italy. Liberalism, though gaining ground day by day, did not become strong enough to effect a revolution until toward the close of Gregory's pontificate; and then the Liberals were willing to await the election of his successor, hoping that the necessity of a revolution would be avoided. Hence, the

sitting of the Conclave, to choose that successor, was an event of uncommon interest. Rome was filled with tremulous expectation. On the morning of June 17th, after the Conclave had been in session forty-eight hours, the doors of the Quirinal palace were thrown open, and Cardinal Mastai was proclaimed Pope, under the title of Pius IX. The announcement was received with universal applause. Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti was in his fifty-fifth year. He was well known to be of a gentle, benevolent disposition, and, what gave even more satisfaction, of liberal politics. No sooner had he entered on his duties than he undertook some important reforms, thereby greatly increasing his popularity. With the exception of the radical Republicans, who were few in number, he had the confidence of all his subjects, and of the progressive party throughout Italy. Nevertheless, his position was most difficult. All the Italian States were moving swiftly in the direction of Liberalism. The association known as "Young Italy," at whose head stood the untiring Mazzini, were stimulating this movement to the utmost; and the school of politicians known as the "Moderates," while preaching constitutionalism and moderation, insisted on an entire political change throughout the entire Peninsula. Pius was confronted by two dangers, called by M. Guizot, "the stationary danger," and "the revolutionary danger." If he went rapidly forward, he would inevitably meet those difficulties that always attend sudden political changes; if he stood still, or proceeded slowly, he would alienate the affections of his subjects, now so enthusiastic, and precipitate immediate revolution. He chose the only safe course—to innovate slowly, and reform progressively. He had goodness enough to solve the immediate problem; but he lacked wisdom, and, above all, firmness. The course he had chosen was not acceptable to his more enthusiastic subjects; and in those stormy times only a strong hand, if even a strong one, could have held them in check. Accordingly, he fell upon the very danger he wished to shun. Alison has properly called Pius, the Louis XVI of the Italian Revolution.

The Revolution that dethroned the Orleans dynasty broke out in Paris, in 1848. It was the torch that kindled the combustible material with which Southern and Central Europe were filled. The Pope did not, and could not, without ceasing to be Pope, keep pace with the demands of his people; the direction of affairs passed more and

more from his hands into those of the excited populace, until he declared that he was no longer a free agent; and finally, in November, he fled in disguise from his own capital. He found an asylum at Gaëta, in the dominions of the King of Naples. In February, 1849, by a vote of 343,000 adult male persons, in a population of about 3,000,000, a Constituent Assembly was created, and invested with the powers of government. On the 9th of that month, by an almost unanimous vote, this Assembly declared the abolition of the Secular Papacy, and proclaimed the States of the Church a free and independent Republic. From his Neapolitan retreat, the Pope anathematized his rebellious subjects, and urged the States of Europe to reseate him on his throne. Strangely enough, the invitation was accepted in the name of that people whose own uprising in the cause of Republicanism, one year before, had set in motion that wave of revolution which dethroned Pius, and swept Europe from the Pyrenees to the farthest confines of Hungary. Though himself the child of Revolution, and the chief magistrate of a Constitutional Republic, Louis Napoleon determined to open the way to the restoration of the exiled Pope. "Already meditating the enthronement of tyranny at home," says Mazzini, "he was desirous, on the one hand, of accustoming the soldiery to fight against the Republican flag, and, on the other, of gaining over the Catholic clergy, and that portion of the French population which derived its inspiration from them. To avow his purposes, was to defeat them. Accordingly, the President argued to the Assembly and to the people that Austria would gain an undue ascendancy in Italy, unless her designs were counteracted by France. An army must be sent to Rome. This army landed at Civita Vecchia in April, 1849. The Romans welcomed the French soldiers as fellow-Republicans. But the French general soon abandoned the disingenuous policy pursued at first, and disclosed his real purpose. On the 11th of June, after a siege of only a month, the tricolor waved above the castle of St. Angelo. The Republic was destroyed. The exile of Gaëta was invited to return. His Holiness, remembering the terrorism of 1848, preferred, for the time, to remain in exile. In April, 1850, he returned under French protection, but to rule an unwilling people. From that time till September, 1870, when the last remains of temporal power were wrung from his grasp by the people of United Italy, there never was a moment when his

government, deprived of external safeguards, was secure against his own subjects.

Four years have now passed since the election of Mastai Ferretti to the Papal throne. They have witnessed great changes in his political opinions. It would be too much to say that he has lost his natural kindliness and benevolence; but his ideas of political administration have wholly changed. He would still shrink from signing the "Syllabus;" but he has adopted its principles. He has witnessed the democratic excesses of '48-'50, and been revolted; he has, himself, undertaken partial reforms, and been rewarded by miserable failure,—all of which brings him to the conclusion that liberty is dangerous, and that repression is the only safe policy. The possession of power and increasing age, under any circumstances, would no doubt have transformed the liberal of 1848 into a conservative; but the Revolution has suddenly made him a confirmed reactionary. His religious and ecclesiastical views take on the color of his new political opinions; he soon falls into the hands of the Jesuits, the enemies of all liberty and progress; and his long pontificate, the longest in the history of the Papacy, has in its principles receded farther and farther into the dark ages.

The time has come to survey the condition of Italy when the revolutionary fires were once more smothered. Prince Metternich, the Austrian diplomatist, was accustomed to deny that the name Italy represented any political entity, and to assert that it was a mere geographical description. Nor was he far out of the way. The Peninsula had not been a political unit since the fall of the Western Empire. The primary cause was foreign invasion; the secondary, domestic faction. A state of affairs that had become traditional prevented the Italian people from controlling their destiny. Though plainly intended, by geographical configuration, and a homogeneity of her people in blood, language, and temper, for one country, the home of one people, the Peninsula was divided into a great number of petty states, ruled by as many princes and princelings. For centuries the Popes had fostered division and dissension; for these were the guarantees of their own influence, and even the conditions of their temporal sovereignty. A united Italy would have demanded Rome for its capital. Hence, Italy, as described by Mazzini, was "a mosaic of large and small kingdoms, more or less falsely and hypocritically

allied." Two of the finest provinces were in the hands of the Austrian, who, through his alliances with the Italian kings and grand dukes, thrust his hand into the very vitals of the country. The crowned heads, including the Pope, were directly interested in maintaining the *statu quo*. They little dreamed how soon and how effectually the *statu quo* would be destroyed. In this anomalous nation, the greatest anomaly was the Popedom. A crowned priest ruled a third of Italy. Now that he has lost his crown, it will be well enough to recite once more how it came in his possession. As the Roman Empire was tumbling into ruins, "a distant and dangerous station among the barbarians of the West," says Gibbon, "excited the spirit and freedom of the Latin bishops. Their popular election endeared them to the Romans; the public and private indigence was relieved by their ample revenues; and the weakness and neglect of the emperors compelled them to consult, both in peace and war, the temporal safety of the city. In the school of adversity the priest insensibly imbibed the virtues and the ambition of a prince; the same character was assumed, the same policy was adopted by the Italian, the Greek, or the Syrian, who ascended the Chair of St. Peter; and after the loss of her legions and provinces, the genius and fortunes of the Popes restored the supremacy of Rome."* The condition of Italy almost compelled them to become politicians. "As the one permanent institution amid incessant change," says Mr. Lea, "the Papacy was the only center around which a national spirit could rally, and the increase of its temporal as well as spiritual authority, might well appear to be the only feasible remedy for the prevailing and increasing anarchy."†

Thus the political influence of the Roman See grew as naturally as imperceptibly out of its spiritual authority. Still its temporal sovereignty had no existence until the middle of the eighth century. Rome had then broken with Constantinople. Casting about for some Western ally, the Popes made choice of the rising Frankish power. An alliance seemed mutually advantageous. The Popes needed an ally to defend them against the Eastern emperors and the Lombard kings. On the other hand, the Carovingian monarchs desired to secure themselves in the possession of the Frankish throne, which they had just usurped. An alliance with the rising ecclesiastical power of the

* "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix.

† "Studies in Church Hist.," page 32.

West could not fail to be advantageous. A bargain was struck; or, at all events, an understanding arrived at. In 752, Boniface, the apostle of Germany, acting under Pope Zacharay's orders, crowned Pepin le Bref King of the Franks; in 755, Pepin marched across the Alps to the assistance of Stephen, Zacharay's successor. Pepin overthrew the Lombards, and, when the slaughter was over, gave to the Pontiff Rome, the Exarchate of Ravenna, and the Pentopolis. In the words of Gibbon, "The splendid donation was granted in supreme and absolute dominion, and the world beheld, for the first time, a Christian bishop invested with the prerogatives of a temporal province."* Charlemagne, the son of Pepin, in 774, confirmed his father's grant. We need not turn aside to trace the history of the famous pious fraud by which the Popes convinced the Frankish kings that they held Italy as a gift from Constantine; nor can we follow the growth of the Papal dominions till they reached their greatest extent. Such was the origin of the so-called "Patrimony of the blessed Peter," so long a disturbing element in European politics.

When Pius IX returned to Rome, in 1850, there was a moral Italy, if not a political. Since the French Revolution of 1793, the Italians had been awaking to a sense of their degradation. They saw themselves the victims of both foreign and domestic despotism. Two mighty inspirations were stirring their hearts—the inspiration of unity and the inspiration of liberty. The humiliating failure of 1848–49 had not quenched them. They accepted the prophecy with which Sismondi had closed his history of the Italian republics twenty years before:

"Italy is crushed; but her heart still beats with the love of liberty, virtue, and glory; she is chained and covered with blood, but she knows her strength and her future destiny; she is insulted by those for whom she has opened the way to every improvement, but she feels that she is formed to take the lead again; and Europe will know no repose till the nation which, in the dark ages, lighted the torch of civilization with that of liberty, shall be enabled herself to enjoy the light which she has created."

But the realization of the national aspirations seemed indefinitely remote. Sir Archibald Alison spoke of Charles Albert's failure in 1849 as having determined, probably for ages, the cause of Italian independence. The accomplishment of that cause was much nearer than the English tory, or even the Italian patriot, thought possible.

* "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix.

Twenty years sufficed to win Italian independence and liberty. We must rapidly trace the steps by which they were won.

For several years the interest of the story now centers in the Kingdom of Sardinia. Though deriving her name from an island in the Mediterranean, most of her territories were on the Continent. They comprised Piedmont, Savoy, the old Republic of Genoa, and some smaller divisions. The area of the kingdom was a little less than thirty thousand square miles, and its population a trifle more than five millions. Nestling under the towering ranges of the Alps, Sardinia was what Pius still persists in calling the Kingdom of Italy, "the Sub-alpine Government." Here the traveler found a rugged type of character than in the other Italian States. Yielding to the rising spirit of Liberalism in 1848, the king, Charles Albert, surrendered the absolutist features of the monarchy, and granted a Constitution. He championed the cause of Italy against Austria in 1848-49, and was defeated. On the fatal field of Novara he resigned his crown to his son, Victor Emmanuel. Sardinia now made the best peace she could, and bided her time. In 1850, Count Cavour entered the Cabinet of the new king, and soon proved himself the greatest statesman Italy has produced in recent times. In addition to his great natural abilities, unceasing industry, knowledge of men, and powerful personality, he was thoroughly versed in practical politics, and especially in the history and theory of constitutional government. He became at once the master-spirit of the Peninsula. If not the founder, he was the ablest exponent of the moderate school of Italian politics—a school that, notwithstanding the diatribes of Mazzini, has done more than all others to solve the Italian problem. Cavour negotiated advantageous commercial treaties with foreign nations, fostered education, stripped the clergy of some of their special privileges, suppressed some of the monastic orders, and developed the natural resources of the kingdom. But his most successful stroke was the alliance with France and England, in 1855. He declared that "the independence of Italy must be conquered in the Crimea." Sardinia furnished a contingent of troops for the Russian war, and won for herself a higher standing among the powers of Europe.

When the count returned, in 1856, from the Paris Conferences, which once more gave peace to Europe, he announced that both England and France were pledged to seek the solution of the Italian

problem. But Austria had taken offense. That power saw that she could maintain her position in the Peninsula only by checking the rising power of Sardinia. Cavour was ready for the struggle. When the war came, in 1859, it found France, thanks to his bold and able policy, arrayed on the side of Italian freedom. The ex-Emperor of the French now began to play that curious and almost inexplicable part in Italian affairs which terminated only with his downfall in 1870. Austria was defeated in two great battles; she would soon have been compelled to make peace at the cost of losing all her Italian possessions, when suddenly, as though startled at his own half-completed work, the emperor concluded the treaty of Villa Franca. Lombardy was surrendered to Italy, but Venetia remained in the hands of the Austrian.

In the mean time several of the small States in Central Italy had risen in revolt, and driven out their rulers. Besides, a revolution now broke out in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, in the South, where the people had long been crushed under the rule of the Bourbon princes. With the efficient aid of Garibaldi and his volunteers, the Sicilian Government was overthrown. More than all, the Austrian Government having been compelled to withdraw its garrisons, which had held them for the Pope, several of the Papal cities broke out into insurrection. In two weeks' time, one-half of the Papal territory was lost. The Pope threatened to excommunicate all who, "by any act or counsel, or any other way, have dared to violate, disturb, and usurp our and this Holy See's power and jurisdiction, and the patrimony of the blessed Peter." He appealed to the sovereigns of Europe, collectively, for aid; but in vain. The French Emperor was unwilling to do more than secure Rome, and he prevented the Spanish Government from giving that assistance, which, left to itself, it would have been glad to render. At length, when the Pope put in the field an army of mercenaries gathered from the various Catholic countries of Europe, the Sardinian Government interposed for the purpose of securing to the Pope's subjects a fair opportunity to make known their will.

In 1860, popular elections were held in the emancipated States, to determine the will of the people. Annexation was the almost universal desire. The people every-where proved themselves ready for unification. They had acted spontaneously, and with the greatest enthusiasm. The Sardinian, either as a soldier or a civilian, was hailed as

a deliverer. Annexation was voted by overwhelming majorities. In the Two Sicilies the vote was 1,300,266 out of 1,400,000. Indeed, the most striking feature of the revolution, more striking even than its suddenness and completeness, was its popular character. No fair-minded man can resist the conclusion that the social and political elements of Italy had an affinity for each other, that they were ready to rush into union so soon as the foreign elements were neutralized. It would be too much to say that the Sardinian statesmen had no interest in the issue as Sardinians. They understood perfectly that the union would take place under the Sardinian crown; but they acted, nevertheless, as Italians rather than as Sardinians; the smaller was swallowed up in the larger patriotism.

An Italian Parliament assembled in Turin in January, 1861. By an almost unanimous vote of both Chambers, Victor Emmanuel was declared King of Italy. Rarely has any great cause made so much progress in two years. With the exception of Venetia and what remains of the Papal States, Italian unity has been won. The patrimony of St. Peter has been reduced from fifteen thousand two hundred and eighty-nine square miles, with a population of 3,124,668, to four thousand eight hundred and ninety-one square miles, with a population of 692,106.

The Italian cause was resisted by the Church at every step. The first article of the Sardinian Constitution of 1848 runs thus: "The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is the only religion of the State. The other forms of worship now existing are tolerated in conformity with the laws." The Parliament enacted that no man's religious belief, whether it were that of the State or not, should prevent his holding civil or political office. Cavour early found the Papacy intrenched across the path of his policy. He announced his great principle, "A free Church in a free State," declaring that "the Church can not, in a community governed on principles of liberty, preserve the privileges to which it was entitled in a state of society in which privilege constituted law." Such doctrines as these could not fail mortally to offend the ecclesiastical party. The last sacraments of the Church were denied to statesmen who assisted to realize them, and who would not disavow their work. But the unpardonable sin was the incorporation of Papal territory into the new Kingdom of Italy. Victor Emmanuel and the Emperor of the French did their

utmost to reconcile the Pope to the new order of things. His Holiness responded *non possumus*. He declared he would sooner endure exile and martyrdom than yield. And yet he could but know that the people of the lost provinces hated his Government, and that his capital, if left to herself, would follow the example of her more fortunate sister cities. No despot ever clung to power with a more tenacious grasp. The new Italian Kingdom now addressed itself to two important and difficult tasks. The first was to consolidate her power and enter on the pathway of progress. In their social and political life, industry, spirit, etc., her people could hardly be said to belong to the modern world. Italy must, therefore, be made a modern country, the administration must be adjusted to constitutional principles, and the people must be familiarized with the machinery of free government. Great public works must be constructed, a large army created and disciplined, mendicancy checked, brigandage suppressed, an impetus given to industrial development, and, more than all, schools provided for the education of the people. The second task was to readjust the delicate relations of Church and State. So far as practicable, political and religious elements must be disentangled—a most difficult undertaking in any country where they have been intertwined for ten centuries. The most troublesome questions were the relations of the bishops to the crown, and the management of the monastic orders. The ecclesiastical party constantly pursued an obstructive policy, and the Government was left alone to carry out Cavour's great principle—a free Church in a free State.

At length the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 afforded the desired opportunity to annex Venetia, the glorious old Republic of Venice, to Italy. Her defeat at Sadowa compelled the Austrian Government to relax her hold of the province; and the people voted for union even more overwhelmingly than those of Tuscany, the Sicilies, and the Papal Legations. In November, 1866, the iron crown of Lombardy was placed on the brow of Victor Emmanuel.

Geographically, the Italian question was now reduced to the single point of obtaining possession of Rome. The eyes of the whole people were directed to the Papal city. That Italy could not accomplish her destiny without Rome, was a national conviction. It is true the Papal dominions were greatly narrowed; that the Pontiff ruled less than a million people; but it was idle to urge these considerations

to an Italian patriot. Mr. Bryce has described the feelings of the Italians thus graphically:

"Plain, common-sense politicians in other countries do not understand this passion for Rome as a capital, and think it their duty to lecture the Italians on their flightiness. The latter do not themselves pretend that the shores of the Tiber are a suitable site for a capital. Rome is lonely, unhealthy, and in a bad strategical position; she has no particular facilities for trade; her people, with some fine qualities, are less orderly and industrious than the Tuscans or the Piedmontese; nevertheless all Italy cries with one voice for Rome, firmly believing that national life can never thrill with strong and steady pulsation till the ancient capital has become the nation's heart. They feel that it is owing to Rome—Rome pagan, as well as Christian—that they once played so grand a part in the drama of European history, and that they have now been able to attain the fervid sentiment of unity which has brought them at last together under one government. Whether they are right; whether, if right, they are likely to be successful,—need not be inquired here. But it deserves to be noted that this enthusiasm for a famous name—for it is nothing more—is substantially the same feeling as that which created the hallowed and holy Empire of the Middle Ages. The events of the last few years, on both sides of the Atlantic, have proved that men are not now, any more than they ever were, chiefly governed by calculations of material profit and loss. Sentiments, fancies, theories have not lost their power; the spirit of poetry has not wholly passed away from politics. And, strange as seems to us the worship paid to mediæval Rome by those who saw the sins and misery of her people, it can hardly have been an intenser feeling than is the imaginative reverence wherewith the Italians of to-day look on the city whence, as from a fountain, all the streams of their national life have sprung, and in which, as in an ocean, they are all again to mingle."*

But over and above these somewhat romantic views, the Italians felt that their capital was in the hands of an enemy. The Italian Premier put the argument fairly in 1866, when he asked, "Supposing France had a foreign government at Paris, how could she exist?" The solution of the Roman question, however, could not be hurried. Mazzini in exile, and the Italian Republicans at home, had insisted, since 1861, that the Government should wrest Rome from the Pope. But the tricolor was the guarantee of the Pope's sovereignty. The emperor, even if he wished, could not withdraw his troops without offending the clerical party at home. A movement on Rome was a declaration of war against France; and the Italian Government wisely waited, hoping that the logic of events would help them out of their embarrassment. The king had announced his policy as early as 1861, when, addressing the Parliament, he said: "I have hitherto raised my voice for acts of daring, and even rashness; but it is as wise to *wait* at the

* "The Holy Roman Empire," pp. 299, 300.

proper moment as to *dare* at the proper moment." The nation acquiesced, but without disguising its impatience. In 1862, the Parliament said in its address to the king: "The time for action for the acquisition of Rome is delayed. For the present, we will strengthen our finances by our active industry; we will increase our army to four hundred thousand men; and then, Sire, with you at its head, we will see who will withhold Rome from us."

In September, 1864, the Italian and French Governments concluded a treaty containing the following stipulations:

"1. Italy engages not to attack the present territory of the Pope, and even to prevent by force any attack proceeding from the exterior.

"2. France will withdraw her troops gradually, as the army of the Pope becomes organized. The evacuation will, nevertheless, be accomplished within two years."

But the French troops were no sooner withdrawn, in 1867, than Garibaldi organized an invasion of the Roman territory. His progress was arrested by the Papal troops, assisted by a fresh expeditionary force sent from France, when he had almost reached the gates of Rome. The popular sympathy for Garibaldi was so strong that the Government hardly dared to interfere with his movements. Distrusting either the good faith or the ability of Italy, the French Emperor once more established a garrison in Rome, which he continued to maintain till he needed his troops nearer home.

So soon as the great struggle with North Germany began, in 1870, the emperor's Government announced its intention of withdrawing its troops. The last French soldier left the city on the 11th of August. No sooner had the emperor made known his intention, than the popular pulse of Italy was quickened. The king's Government proclaimed its purpose of upholding the treaty of 1864. The Italian Republicans replied by shouting for the Republic, and attempting to raise the Republican flag in Florence. Believing, or affecting to believe, that if it resisted the popular impulse, revolution would be the consequence, the ministry gave way, and sent an army into the Papal territories. An attempt was made to reconcile the Pope to the inevitable. He replied, with the utmost bitterness and resolution, that he would never yield; so that on the 20th of September, after a short bombardment, the Italian troops entered the city. On the 2d of October, by a vote of 133,681 to 1,507 the Romans declared for

annexation ; thus adding their testimony to the universal desire of the Italians for union and freedom. On the 1st of July, 1871, Rome became once more the capital of Italy.

As the Catholic organs constantly charge the Italian Government with acting in bad faith, it is proper to consider that point for a moment. In the first place, there can be no doubt that the Government concluded the treaty of 1864 with reluctance. It consented to guarantee Rome only as the condition of getting the French out of Italy. In the second place, the Government was never very earnest in its attempts to execute the treaty. Nor is it strange that it should have acted just as it did act. In the third place, it is equally clear that the Italian people, so strong was the desire to possess Rome, could not have been repressed without the shedding of more blood than the authorities were justified in spilling. The moral sense of Christendom has always regarded the Italian Government as acting under moral duress, both in 1864 and in 1870, and it has refused to hold it accountable. History will not reverse the verdict.

The overthrow of the Secular Papacy threw a new question on the hands of the Italian Government. No one thought of un-Catholicizing the State, or of requiring the Pope to leave Rome. The Religious Papacy stood intact. The new question was to adjust it, with all its cumbrous machinery, to the sovereignty of the State. From every point of view, other than the Ultramontane, it must be conceded that the Government treated the Pope with great liberality. The Law of the Papal Guarantees, which received the royal assent May 13, 1871, declared the Pontiff's person inviolable, placed all crimes and offenses against him on a level with those directed against the king, conceded him royal honors, granted to him a precedence of honor and the liberty to keep guards for the protection of his person and palaces. An endowment of 3,225,000 francs was retained in his favor ; a sum equal to that appropriated to the ecclesiastical administration under his own Government. He was declared "completely free to fulfill all the functions of his spiritual ministry ;" but religious liberty was secured to all. In a word, unless Italy once more resigned Rome to the Pope, it is difficult to see how he could have been treated with more consideration. Nor was there any reason to mistrust the sincerity of the Government. Now that the temporal power had fallen, Italy had every reason for dealing generously with the Pope.

The great majority of Italians were Catholics. While they did their utmost to dethrone him as a king, they still regarded him as the successor of St. Peter. Every dictate of sound policy would lead the king's Government to treat the first citizen of the realm with distinguished respect. Pius was implacable. He insisted on his *non possumus* policy. He refused to recognize the Kingdom of Italy, spoke contemptuously of "the Sub-alpine Government," declared himself a prisoner, and refused the dotation of three and a quarter millions of francs. Such are the present relations between the Pontiff and the State, of which he has become a most reluctant subject.

We have drawn out this sketch of the overthrow of the Secular Papacy, not so much on account of its historical interest as for the light it throws on a very important question: Will it be re-established? The Clerical party pretend to regard the recent action of the Italians as a temporary delirium. They say the present is only one of many periods of religious depression, that falsehood and wrong can not permanently triumph, and that the temporalities will some day be restored. Before considering the probabilities of this being done, we must state the reason why their restoration is said to be necessary.

Pope Stephen accepted the temporal power, in 755, without stopping to give a reason or offer an apology. He took the donation of Pepin because he could have it; and his successors held it because it could not be wrested from them. It is, indeed, true that the political condition of Italy was propitious; perhaps true that the Romans were better off under their rule than they would have been under that of any other princes; but the promptness of the Popes in entering the door of their great opportunity, proves that they were actuated by secular ambition. By and by the intelligence and moral sense of Europe began to quicken; ecclesiastical power began to wane; men first demanded of the bishop why he wore a miter, and then of the Pope why he wore the triple crown. At last, feeling, in a vague way, the incongruity of its position, the Papacy concluded the time had come to assign a reason for the existence of the temporal power. It was that the Spiritual Papacy could not exist without the Secular. This proposition is obviously an after-thought. It has no force to a Protestant, even if true; but the vast majority of Romanists have regarded it as altogether conclusive. How sound it is from their stand-point, we shall have occasion to inquire hereafter. If the Secular

Papacy is ever re-established, it must be done either by Italians or by some foreign power. Let us see how much hope the Holy Father can find in this dilemma.

After long waiting and laborious effort, the Italians have achieved their nationality and freedom. No one can follow the history without perceiving that they have been governed by the purest political motives. Their statesmen and soldiers have not wrought to build up an arrogant, domineering military power like France, but to win security and liberty for their country. Mr. Bryce presents the case in a paragraph so eloquent, that we can not resist the temptation to quote it:

"At length, after long ages of sloth, the stagnant waters were troubled. The Romans, who had lived in listless contentment under the paternal sway of the Popes, received new ideas from the advent of the revolutionary armies of France, and have found the Papal system, since its re-establishment fifty years ago as a modern bureaucratic despotism, far less tolerable than it was of yore. Our own days have seen the name of Rome become again a rallying-cry for the patriots of Italy; but in a sense most unlike the old one. The contemporaries of Arnold and Rienzi desired freedom only as a step to universal domination; their descendants more wisely, yet not more from patriotism than from a pardonable civic pride, seek only to be the capital of the Italian Kingdom. Dante prayed for a monarchy of the world, a reign of peace and Christian brotherhood; those who invoke his name as the earliest prophet of their creed, strive after an idea that never crossed his mind, the national union of Italy."*

But the Clerical party has pretended that the *plebiscitum* of October, 1870, was not a fair expression of Roman sentiment. If they really had any doubts touching this point, the municipal election of August last must have removed them. This party, resolutely refusing to recognize Victor Emmanuel's Government *de facto*, as well as *de jure*, had carefully abstained from participation in the elections. But now came a change of front; the Clericals put candidates in nomination and did their utmost to elect them; but they were beaten by an overwhelming majority.

The history of Italian unification, the unanimity and earnestness of the whole people, their exultation in their success, the rapidity with which they are fusing into one body, give no ground for concluding that, of themselves, the Italians will surrender Rome, and uncrown the glorious work of the last twenty years. Hence, if Rome is restored to the Pope, the restoration must be effected by some foreign

* "The Holy Roman Empire," page 299.

power. Who is to play once more the part of Pepin? The question leads us, for the first time in this discussion, beyond the Peninsula. Let us first look at some general considerations affecting the case.

The course recently pursued by the Holy See has given deep offense to all the Catholic powers making any pretensions to independence and self-respect. In 1864, the Pope issued the famous "Encyclical Letter" and "Syllabus," which have been well described as "a formal protest from Rome against pretty much every thing that had been accomplished for the social and political improvement of the human race since the dark ages." He spoke of the extreme grief with which he had "beheld a terrible tempest stirred up by so many erroneous opinions, and the dreadful and never-enough-to-be-lamented mischiefs which redound to Christian people from such errors." The "Syllabus" was a catalogue of these errors. Of the eighty enumerated, we quote a few for illustration :

"15. Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason. . . .

"24. The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power.

"42. In the case of conflicting laws between the two powers, the civil law ought to prevail.

"55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.

"77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.

"78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.

"80. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with progress, liberalism, and civilization, as lately introduced."

The reader must note that these propositions are condemned as errors, not approved as truths. He can readily change them into a statement of positive doctrine.

One of the most marked tendencies of recent times has been to separate Church and State ; or, to express it in a broader form, to secularize politics. The tendency began with the Reformation, and it has continued to strengthen till the present day. Every Catholic country that has advanced one *stadium* beyond the Middle Ages, has

felt its power. Hence, the propositions of the "Syllabus" fell across the stream of this great world-current. They plainly teach that the State is subordinate to the Church, and that religious uniformity should be enforced, if necessary. It is quite true that Popes had inculcated such doctrines before, but it was supposed they had fallen into desuetude. If, in the times of the Gregories and Innocents, when the Popes were almost omnipotent in Europe, princes had resisted these pretensions, even unto exile and death, they were not likely to bow to them in the days of Papal decrepitude. The French Government forbade the publication of the "Encyclical" and "Syllabus," and some of the Governments which permitted it, disclaimed their sentiments.

The Pope also exhibited a disposition to enlarge his spiritual prerogatives. In 1854, dispensing with a council, and assisted only by a correspondence with the bishops, he proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. From the first, the powers having a considerable Catholic population regarded the Vatican Council with suspicion. They asked: (1) "Are the propositions of the "Syllabus" to be declared articles of faith?" And, (2) "Will a declaration of the Pope's infallibility revive with new sanctions the arrogant political pretensions put forth by the Roman See in former ages?" Several Cabinets addressed diplomatic notes to the Pope's Government. That of France counseled the Fathers, in council, to confine themselves to theological and religious questions; that of Austria warned the See not to encroach upon the rights of the State; while that of the North German Bund declared that, in Germany, Catholics and Protestants must dwell together peaceably, and expressed the hope that old antagonisms would not be revived. The grounds of these apprehensions must be more carefully traced.

In 1558, Paul IV issued his Bull "Cum ex Apostolatus Officio," in which he declared that the Pope is God's representative on earth; that he has full authority and power over nations and kingdoms; that he judges all, and is judged by none in this world; that all princes and monarchs, as well as bishops, as soon as they fall into heresy or schism, without the need of any legal formality, are irrevocably deposed, deprived forever of all rights of government, and incur sentence of death. The Bull "Unam Sanctam," dating from the early part of the fourteenth century, contains similar propositions. "There are

two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. . . . Both are in the power of the Church. . . . One sword must be under the other, the temporal under the spiritual. . . . The spiritual instituted the temporal power, and judges whether that power is well exercised. . . . We, therefore, assert, define, and pronounce that it is necessary to salvation to believe that every human being is subject to the Pontiff of Rome." Once more, the Bull "In Cœna Domini," put in final shape by Boniface VIII, in 1568, cursed all heretics and schismatics, all who favor or defend them, including princes and magistrates permitting them to reside in their countries. It also cursed all persons who keep or print the books of heretics without Papal permission, and all who appeal from a Papal decision to a future General Council.

Any man who knows the world of to-day, can readily understand what would follow any formidable attempt to reconstruct it on this model. It is quite true that these old pronunciamientos had generally been regarded as the extreme and unrighteous utterances of arrogant Popes; but the question, How will the infallibility decree effect them? was now invested with a living interest. How much affect the remonstrances produced at Rome, if any, can scarcely be determined. At all events, the "Syllabus" was not declared of faith, and the Council contented itself with declaring that the Roman Pontiff is infallible, when (it did not say *only* when) he speaks *ex cathedra*; that is, as the pastor and teacher of all Christians defines a dogma of faith or morals. It is, therefore, still in doubt how the "Syllabus," as well as the Bulls described above, are to be regarded, since we are not told when the Pope thus speaks or defines. Some Catholics still regard them as the private views of the Popes who put them forth; others consider them infallible.

Now, it would not do to conclude that the great mass of Catholic subjects would practically obey these Bulls, even if they were declared dogmatic. In his essay on "The Civil Disabilities of the Jews," Macaulay has wisely said: "It is altogether impossible to reason from the opinions which a man professes to his feelings and actions. . . . We forget that the same weakness, the same laxity, the same disposition to prefer the present to the future, which make men worse than a good religion make them better than a bad one." We complain of the inconsistencies and illogicality of men. Perhaps,

after all, they result in as much good as evil. However that may be, we often have reason to thank God that men do not live up to their professed principles. But while there is not the slightest probability that the great mass of Catholics in Italy, Germany, Austria, or France would be bound by the political doctrines of the "Syllabus" and the Bulls, even if they were declared of the faith, there can be no doubt that those doctrines, in such case, would do immense mischief by weakening the bonds of allegiance, by stirring up the fanatical, by arraying the clergy against the State, and by fostering antagonisms between Protestants and Catholics. No sovereign, ruling a large Catholic population, whatever his own religion, who makes any pretensions to independence of character, can see with satisfaction these doctrines even preached in his dominions. No one understands their tendency better than intelligent Catholic statesmen. Hence, every great Catholic power must set itself like flint against the Ultramontane doctrines, so far as itself is concerned.

The pronounced Ultramontanism of the Roman See serves to explain several events in recent European affairs, of more than ordinary interest. It was one of the causes of the great revolution in Austrian politics in 1866-68. It had much to do with the virtual abrogation of the Concordat, and it gave a mighty impulse to the secularizing movement. By the Austrian Constitution of 1867, every recognized Church and religious society has the right of common public worship, and those not recognized have the same right, provided their worship involves no violation of law or good morals. The laws of 1868 legalized civil marriage, took the exclusive direction of primary education in the public schools out of the hands of the clergy, and restored in those schools the principle of civil authority. The same laws sanctioned the liberty of conscience in the most absolute manner, and in several important particulars abridged the power of the clergy in ecclesiastical matters. These measures, described by the Pope in his Allocution denouncing them as "odious" and "abominable," were enacted by the Government, partly to defend itself against Ultramontanism, and partly to carry out the new *régime* inaugurated after the defeat of 1866. In the second place, the same tendency explains the marked favor with which several States regard the Old Catholic movement. But, more than all, taken in connection with the history of the last six years, it explains the secularizing of the

schools in North Germany, and the breaking up of the Order of the Jesuits. These last measures are so important, that they demand a fuller notice.

When she had defeated Austria and France, and raised herself to the position of the first European power, Prussia found that she had incurred the hostility of the Catholic Church. Bismarck has described the situation thus :

"While two Catholic powers existed on our borders, each supposed to be stronger than Prussia (that is, Austria and France), and more or less at the disposal of the Catholic Church, we were allowed to live in peace and quiet. Things changed after our victory of 1866 (Sadowa), and the consequent ascendancy of the Protestant dynasty of Hohenzollern. And now that another Catholic power has gone the same way, and we have acquired a might which, with God's help, we mean to keep, our opponents are more embittered than ever, and make us the butt of their constant attacks."

The German Chancellor saw that the Roman ecclesiastics in Germany were enemies to their own country, in the interests of the Papal monarchy. He saw that these ecclesiastics were working through the public schools, and he, therefore, carried a law through the Legislature abolishing clerical school inspection, and creating State inspectors. He saw that the Jesuits and their related orders were the head and front of Ultramontanism, and that the more Germans they could un-Germanize, the better they were pleased. The Chancellor therefore carried a law forbidding the existence of the order in the Empire. The *Catholic World* says the German Jesuits are only seven hundred and eight in number, and represents them as engaged in teaching and preaching. There is not a doubt that they are engaged in teaching and preaching Ultramontanism. It represents that they are the most harmless of subjects, and says it is "useless to talk of conspiracies." "Show us those conspiracies," it demands ; "point them out in black and white."* Very well. The original conspiracy was entered into when Loyola instituted the Society of Jesus—a conspiracy against every thing that stands in the way of effecting the political and spiritual enslavement of the race ; and the members of the Society renew their oaths every time the Pope issues a new pronunciamento against the rights of man. The dust-throwing of the *World* will not blind thoughtful observers to the fact that the Jesuits are the advance-guard of the uncompromising Papal

* "Bismarck and the Jesuits," October No., 1872.

party—the party of the “Syllabus” and the Vatican Council. Prince Bismarck’s law is harsh and quite contrary to American ideas; but we must remember that Germany is not the United States. Nothing is easier in theory than the separation of political and ecclesiastical affairs. Nothing easier than to say the Church and the State should each be independent in its own sphere. But few problems are more difficult of practical solution. In Utopia these elements need not antagonize. Any *doctrinaire* can say religion should be free, conscience should not be coerced. But suppose the religion in question inculcates polygamy, as Mormonism does in Utah? Suppose it is proposed to exclude the Bible from the public schools, as in New York or Cincinnati? Suppose you have to deal with the Jesuits in the present condition of the German Empire? In the United States, where we have built up our civilization unembarrassed by an older social and political order, it is difficult to understand how troublesome the question of Church and State is in Europe, where political and religious affairs have been intermingled for ages. Bismarck is dealing with a wily and powerful foe. We question, on grounds of policy, his last movement; but it is clearly defensible in the light of European principles and precedents.

We thus find the Roman See lying athwart the path of the great political movement of the age. As a result of her mediæval policy, she has alienated the Catholic powers like Austria, and embittered the Protestant ones like Prussia. And there is small probability that any one of them would take an active part in restoring a politico-ecclesiastical monarchy, whose very existence, but for its weakness, would be a continual menace. Yielding to some motives to be given hereafter, France might undertake the task; but, unless she belied her past history, she would be the first power to resist in her own case the principles of the Ultramontane party.

But let us look at the leading Catholic nations, one by one, to see which one of them is likely to undertake the restoration of the temporalities. In 1859, the Spanish Government was willing to interfere in the quarrel between the Pope and the Italian people; but since that time the infamous Isabella has been driven into exile, and a son of Victor Emmanuel placed on the throne of Ferdinand the Catholic. Ultramontanism is no longer dominant in Spanish politics. We hazard no conjectures as to the permanency of King

Amadeus's dynasty; but, in no conceivable event, can the Popedom be restored by a Spanish army. For a long period previous to 1859, Austria assisted in upholding the Papal power in Italy; but the great defeats of that year and of 1866 drove her beyond the Alps. In 1867, she took seriously in hand the reorganization of her Empire, and with that task she will, for a long period, be occupied. Austrian interest is opposed to the restoration of a power that has called her present constitution odious and abominable, and she is in no condition to espouse the Pope's cause, even if disposed to do so.

France is more likely to furnish the new Pepin than any other European State. She has always considered herself the especial defender of the Holy See. Her provinces are now swept by a religious revival of unusual power. A French abbè has recently declared, "France is still the France of the Crusades, and the day is not far distant when she will again seize the sword of St. Louis." No doubt the Church party in France would gladly see Rome restored to the Pope; no doubt President Thiers, who has long been a champion of the Secular Papacy, shares, to a considerable extent, their feelings; nor is there any doubt that a successful foreign war would gratify the vanity of the nation. The French regard the occupation of Rome by Victor Emmanuel as a part of Germany's triumph, and as a part of her own defeat in 1870; but France is in no condition at present to espouse any foreign cause. Great as her recuperative power unquestionably is, she can not soon regain what her vanity has already cost her. More than all, she would not be allowed to effect her purpose even if, left to herself, she had the ability and the desire to accomplish it. The conference of the three emperors in Berlin in September, is understood to have sealed an agreement among them to the effect that France shall not be allowed to reassert herself as she was wont to do in European affairs. Besides, it is understood that the same conference sealed a further agreement that the emperors will exert themselves to maintain a general peace. Russia needs peace, that she may be free to carry out her Asiatic policy; Austria, that she may recover from the losses of '59 and '66; Germany, that she may reap the full fruits of Sadowa and Sedan. Peace is the very policy that Italy needs. The modernizing of her civilization is but fairly commenced. At present, it is questionable how she would stand the shock of war. The limbs of the Peninsula, after having been

long broken and separated, have been put in their proper places. An opportunity for them to knit firmly together is needed. That done, Italy will be strong enough to defend herself against all comers. It is quite true that conferences of emperors do not control the destinies of the world. Europe contains a sufficiency of combustible material, and a small spark might kindle the flames of war. But so far as we can see, no foreign power is likely at present, or in the near future, to attempt the restoration of the Secular Papacy; and the probability of such an attempt being made in the remoter future, or of its succeeding, if made, can furnish but slender ground for Papal expectation.

Whether arguing the question on special or general grounds, we find no reason to anticipate the restoration of the temporalities. We shall, therefore, consider the Kingdom of Italy and the downfall of the Secular Papacy as accomplished facts. How much importance belongs to the *de facto* recognition of the Government at the August election, is questionable. Time will tell whether it is a new departure, a recognition of Italy as a *fait accompli*, or whether it is only a spasmodic, meaningless movement. If Pius IX and his advisers had but ordinary wisdom, they would bow to the logic of events, and accept the situation; but no honest man, who regards himself infallible, is likely to adopt and pursue what, in a worldly sense, we would call a wise policy. His very habit of mind puts it out of the question. As we regard the present Pontiff sincere, we think it of little use to inquire what he would do if left to himself. But he is not left to himself. He is the creature of the *Curia*; and no men in the world have a clearer idea of what they are after than the men who now constitute that body. They have set their hearts on a restoration. There can be no doubt that they are summoning the moral power of the universal Catholic Church for a renewal of the conflict with Italy and the temper of the age; nor that they will employ all the pecuniary, political, and military forces that they can command. The Secular Papacy will not die without one further effort; but unless it can work a miracle as notable as that wrought by the prophet Isaiah, when he "brought the shadow ten degrees backward, by which it had gone down on the dial of Ahaz," we may believe that its dominion is forever lost.

We reach now a question far transcending any of those yet

considered—the future of the Catholic Church. We are not indifferent to Italian unity, nor to the political liberties of the Romans; but the spiritual enfranchisement of the great army of Roman Catholics would be a far greater good. It comes in our way to discuss the question only so far as it is effected by the loss of the temporal power.

We begin the discussion with a very obvious but often overlooked distinction: the Secular Papacy is one thing, the Religious Papacy quite another. The fact that they have been both united in one man, must not blind us to their radical difference. Failing to make this distinction, some thoughtful men have apparently taken it for granted that the loss of the temporalities involves the downfall of Roman Catholicism. So far from this being true, the overthrow of the Secular Papacy can affect the Religious only mediately and indirectly. Pius IX still wears the miter of the Universal Bishop, now that the tiara has been snatched from his brow. We must remember that there was a Pope before Pepin descended from the Alps into the plains of Lombardy, and that there have been periods in the history of the Papacy when the Pontiffs neither ruled the Romans, nor lived in Rome. French, Spaniards, Germans, and Italians have made war on the Pope as a temporal sovereign, and, at the same time bowed to his spiritual prerogatives. Were Pius IX, in his old age, expelled from Rome, he could pass over the Alps into the Tyrol, or over the sea to France, or could accept the invitation of the *New York Herald* and come to America, and he would be followed to his retreat by the affection and reverence of his spiritual subjects. His spiritual manifestoes would be received with as much respect and submissiveness as now. Nay, more, he would be regarded with an unusual interest; he would be thought the victim of cruelty and intolerance; nor is there any room to doubt that his recent reverses have, at least temporarily, quickened the sympathies of his spiritual children.

Some men fail altogether to understand Roman Catholicism. They regard it a gigantic abuse, and such it is. They think it a vast administrative machine, admirably contrived to crush human nature; and it is that too. But they do not see that, more than either of these, it is a habit of mind, a tone of religious thought, a body of theological doctrine which, granting its premises, is more severely logical and compact than any other system in Christendom, with the possible exception of Calvinism. They do not see that Catholicism

is a complete spiritual *cultus*, and to those who accept it, a most fascinating tradition. The real nature of Catholicism has an immediate and positive bearing on the present argument. You can smite with the sword an institution, such as slavery in the Southern States of our Union, or such as the Secular Papacy in Italy, and it will fall to the dust; but doctrines, faiths, devotions, hopes, and traditions can not be thus destroyed, unless you exterminate the people who embrace them. Military power can call into being a new class of forces, which will ultimately work out new intellectual and moral results; but, short of extermination, it can not produce such results immediately. You may imprison or banish the Pope who rules in Rome, but what can you do with the Pope who is in the hearts of so many millions of Catholics?

Some have even argued that the continuance of the temporal power would hasten the decline of the Spiritual Papacy. Frances Power Cobbe, writing in 1864, traced the argument in these words:

"So long as the Pope holds the temporal power against the wishes of the nation, and deprives them of their much desired capital, so long he is incurring their detestation. Each day that Pio IX holds Rome, he loses his moral influence. By and by, if this continue a few years more, the hatred of the temporal tyranny will extend to the spiritual power, universally, in all Italian hearts; and *then* the two will fall, with one mighty crash, together. But if the Pope were to abandon all that he holds against the desires of the people, and conciliate them by frankly accepting their programme of a united Italy, with Rome for its capital, *then*, on the other hand, he would remove the cause of animosity, the spiritual power would be separated in men's minds from the temporal, and Heaven only knows how many ages more it might survive."*

It is well known that fervent Catholics have shared these opinions to the extent of believing that the temporal power was the incubus of the Church. Nor is their reasoning, by any means, destitute of force. We do not adopt it, but we see clearly that the two Papacies are quite distinct, and that the fall of the one will not, of itself, produce the fall of the other.

It has been stated above that the Pope could reside in the Tyrol, in France, or in the United States, and retain his spiritual authority. For a time, there is no reason to suppose it would suffer the slightest abatement. Such, however, could not be permanently the case. Few are aware to what extent men are under the dominion of the imagination. It is hardly too much to say that the Ideal rules the

* "*Italics*," pp. 162, 163.

world. One of the most striking facts in the recent history of Catholicism, is the astonishing growth of Mariolatry; and its history gives a striking illustration. The following sentences, quoted from Miss Power Cobbe's chapter, "Madonna Immaculata," reach near the heart of the *cultus* of Mary: "Make Mary old and plain, and she can no longer be Madonna. . . . If Catholics could but be persuaded that their beautiful, stately Queen of Heaven was ever an aged and care-worn Syrian peasant, there would be an amazing change in their sentiments. . . . Mary may be poor and humble of degree without detracting from her glory. But one thing she must not be—ugly."* The philosophy of these remarks underlies the whole Roman system, and it intimately affects the question of the Supreme Pontiff's residence. His throne rests on historical foundations, and these are found only in Rome.

The Catholic Church is the especial custodian of the great name and tradition of Imperial Rome. It has labored with no small success to appropriate to its own purposes the full power of that spell which the very name lays on the minds of all cultivated men. The head of the See derives his title from the chief of the Pagan religion; the Catholic ritual is in many particulars borrowed from Paganism, as are many parts of the Catholic doctrine. About the City cluster the associations and traditions of the first ages of the Church. It is the city of a great army of martyrs. According to the Catholic tradition, the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, planted the Roman Church, and watered it in its infancy. Here they suffered martyrdom. Here, in the form of splendid church edifices, are the memorials of their labors. Tradition points out the places of their imprisonment, their death, and their burial. Here the Prince of the Apostles erected his throne, and from it ruled the Church for a quarter of a century. Rome is full of the reputed relics of saintly confessors, some of them genuine, some spurious; the genuine gathered with pious care from the earliest seats of Christianity, the spurious manufactured to order; but both venerated alike by an indiscriminating superstition. Underneath its streets, and stretching far out under the desolate Campagna, are the gloomy Catacombs, in which for more than two centuries the Christians sought safety in times of persecution. In no other city was

* "*Italics*," pp. 313-14-15.

the conflict between Paganism and Christianity so severe; in no other was the victory so complete; while all others combined could scarcely furnish so many monuments of the triumph. Catholicism has taken both actual and poetic vengeance upon Pagan Rome. The Castle of St. Angelo, for ages the citadel and donjon of the City, is the mausoleum of Hadrian. The St. Peter that surmounts Trajan's Column is a remodeled statue of the Olympian Jupiter. The City abounds in the most magnificent churches and basilicas, many of them expressive symbols of the overthrow of Paganism. The grand piazza, contained within the elliptical columnar porticoes of St. Peter's, is the very ground included within the Circus of Nero, where numberless victims, many of them Christians, fell in the cruel sports of the Amphitheater, and where Peter is said to have been buried. The great hall of the Baths of Diocletian, adapted to its new purpose by the genius of Michael Angelo, is the Church of Santa Maria degli Angeli. In the door-ways of the Colosseum, through which the lions rushed to devour Christian martyrs, stand Catholic altars; and the dens of the wild beasts are occupied by priests as confessionals. Even the Pantheon, dedicated by Agrippa to all the gods, is appropriated to ecclesiastical uses. A church stands on the Capitol. No other city in the world is so rich in religious and ecclesiastical art. All that architecture, statuary, painting, and music can do to impress and overpower the sensuous nature of man, has here been done. Finally, from the earliest times, Rome has been the heart of Catholic Christianity. It was the center of the evangelizing labors which converted Western Europe to the faith. It was from Rome that Augustin went to Britain to convert the Saxons, in the sixth century; Boniface to Germany, to convert the Germans, in the eighth; and Xavier to the East, to convert the Asiatics, in the sixteenth. It is the seat of the long line of almost three hundred Pontiffs. As a consequence, to the Catholic faithful the Papal City is one vast reliquary, a gigantic shrine. He who supposes that in Rome herself the Papacy has not an immense power, is ignorant both of human nature and history. If Mary could not be Madonna if to the Catholic imagination she could be made old and ugly, neither could Catholicism long hold its own if deprived of the peculiar influences of the Papal City. The See of St. Peter is the See of Rome, geographically as well as spiritually; and it is hardly too much

to say, without the City of St. Peter the apostle's pretended successor would be a magician deprived of his wand, a diviner robbed of his divining-rod, a sorcerer who has lost his charm.

We have not made these remarks, supposing that the Italian Government will drive the Pontiff into exile, or that he will go of his own motion. If we may credit reports, Pius sometimes talks of quitting Rome. The talk is probably for effect. It is hardly conceivable that he will go, unless compelled to do so. But the remarks show what would be the inevitable tendency in case either of the two alternatives should happen. More than all, however, so far as the present argument is concerned, they show what must be, in some degree, the tendency if he remain in the City. Since Constantine, early in the fourth century, exchanged the banks of the Tiber for the shore of the Golden Horn, the Roman Bishops, with few exceptions, have been the masters of the capital he abandoned. In the main, they have governed it according to their mind; and what they have made of it all the world knows. One thing they have certainly done—made it contribute to their own power. They have organized its whole administration—the treasury, the military, the police, the *filles*, and the spectacular worship—with direct reference to ecclesiastical ends. We do not question that the king's Government acted in good faith when it declared the Pontiff “completely free to fulfill all the functions of his spiritual ministry;” nor do we doubt that it would be very willing to pay, for many years to come, and perhaps permanently, the dotation of 3,225,000 francs. But the machinery of the Church will hardly be found to work well when detached from the State. As there never could have been a full-fledged spiritual Pope if the emperors had remained in Rome, and if the City had been the capital of a strong secular State during the Middle Ages; so there can hardly be one when Roman allegiance is divided. Rome has become the property of the Italian people. The historic glory of the City will be more and more diverted from ecclesiastical channels. The King of Italy can scarcely fail to be a more striking figure than the Supreme Pontiff. We have not forgotten the arguments urged in preceding paragraphs; they are not inconsistent with the present conclusions. We do not think the inevitable tendency will be felt at once, or even within a few years; it may not make itself perceptibly felt in a generation; but in the long-run it must assert itself.

It remains to add one further consideration—the loss of prestige. Since there was any danger of their losing it, the Popes have insisted that the possession of Rome was indispensable to the government of the Church. If they have made converts to this doctrine, the faith of these converts must be somewhat disturbed. Moreover, the Papacy can not abandon the old argument, or shift its ground without loss of character. More than all, it has been beaten, and it can not long conceal the fact from its adherents. As this becomes plainer and plainer, it seems impossible that the defeat will not have a paralyzing influence upon the whole Church, from the heart to the extremities.

The *Westminster Review* has lately expressed the opinion that Catholicism will survive Protestantism. Lord Macaulay, in one of the finest bursts of his eloquence, states his conviction that the Papacy has more than an equal chance with European civilization. We agree with the Rationalistic reviewer to this extent, that Catholicism is sure to outlive the forms in which Protestantism now presents herself. But, while not insensible to the force of the arguments presented by the English lord, we can not accept his conclusion. The Spiritual Papacy must give place to a truer and purer religion. This will not be at once, or even soon; but it must come at last. Its death will be effected by a great variety of forces. But when the historian traces the history of its fall, and assigns their proper effect to all of the conspiring causes, he will assign a prominent place to the downfall of Secular Papacy.

III.—POPULAR AMUSEMENTS AS SEEN THROUGH THE LAW OF CHRIST.

IN this world, good and evil are strangely commingled. Tares and wheat grow in the same soil, are refreshed by the same dew, and warmed by the same sun. The question of morals may be truthfully represented as being in a decidedly mixed condition. It is often extremely difficult for even a wise and thoughtful man to determine, with any thing like precision, where the good ends and the bad begins. The one shades off into the other in lines and tints so very delicate and impalpable as often to deceive the most wary and observant. Than human society, we know of nothing more complicated. It is a subject not to be disposed of with a wave of the hand or a flourish of the pen; and we greatly rejoice that to-day, more than ever before, it is engaging the fixed attention of the best and most cultivated minds of the world. But in America the question of social morals is environed with more perplexities than in any other land under heaven; and for the obvious reason that there is less homogeneity here than elsewhere. We were born under different skies. In education, in religion, in social customs, in politics, there exists every conceivable opinion. That which seems right in the eyes of one man, is severely condemned by another. Some customs are sanctioned by age; customs, too, the moral soundness of which is seriously questioned by a large and influential class of citizens. In these social and ethical conflicts, both parties feel themselves aggrieved. Each regards the other as in some sense an enemy. Popular sentiment is appealed to on the one hand; the strong arm of civil law is invoked on the other; while, in some instances, riot and bloodshed, attended by a total disregard of public opinion, attest the dreadful lengths to which a certain class of men are disposed to go; while the "Church"—by which we mean, in this connection, the various sects of Christendom—has given but an uncertain, or, at the best, a variable sound.

To those who may be disposed to question the accuracy of this last statement, we beg leave to invite attention to the fact that even

extreme devotion to worldly and fashionable amusements is no bar to membership in the great majority of Churches. While it is joyfully admitted that, in all religious organizations, there may be found individuals who condemn such conduct as inconsistent with the Christian character, still it is not true that the Churches, as a whole, reprobate such practices to the point of excommunication. A feeble protest may be made, but made only to be disregarded.

We have never yet known a person to be excluded from the communion of any Church on account of attendance at, or even participation in, balls, theaters, operas, masquerades, etc. ; and it is notoriously true that these things are openly encouraged by some of our most respectable and socially potential Churches. We have known persons to refuse to become members of a Christian congregation in which these practices were utterly discountenanced, on the sole ground that in certain other Churches no restrictions whatever were imposed upon their indulgence in such pastimes. And we have known men in authority, in such Churches, to promise persons immunity from discipline, if they would consent to attach themselves to their respective communions. And, furthermore, we know people to-day whose only reason for holding membership in certain Churches is, not because they love the doctrine, but because they are privileged to dance and attend theaters to their heart's content. What a reason is this for preferring one Church above another ! True, we have what is called the season of Lent ; but let us not forget that Lent is preceded by Mardi Gras, and followed by Easter. About the only people who sit in sackcloth and ashes during these forty days are the managers and lessees of theaters and ball-rooms. At all events, their penitence has the quality of sincerity. They look forward, with longing and hungry eyes, to the close of the season of Lent, in order that their wasted exchequers may be replenished by receipts from Christian pockets. They well understand that the falling off of their business during these forty black days of enforced abstinence, will be well requited. They quite comprehend that this temporary and fashionable restraint upon the fleshly appetites of the faithful has but whetted them to a sharper and keener edge. And, knowing these things, the best possible bills of fare—such as the “Black Crook” and “White Fawn,” for instance—are produced, in order that they may minister comfort to the emaciated followers of the meek and lowly Jesus.

But we suppose it possible for good men to take extreme and untenable positions in this as in almost all other questions. We would avoid extremes; we would avoid dogmatism; we would avoid all unfairness; and we would treat both sides of the question with becoming respect. The apostle Paul commands Christians—Christians in deed, not in name only—to “prove all things, and hold fast that which is good;” and the editor of the *QUARTERLY* has manifested his approval of this teaching by adopting the passage, in pure Greek, as the motto of his invaluable journal. There it stands, upon the back of every number. Those words represent to my mind the centrifugal forces of the Gospel.

We assume that such forces inhere in the Gospel. Very well; then we choose the words which we have quoted, as fairly representing them. Here is the liberty, and here is the limit, of human action in those things which belong to the proper development and cultivation of man's spiritual nature. We may call these the conserving forces of the Gospel. That such Gospel conservatism is necessary, appears from a fact already hinted at; namely, the natural tendency of the mind to run into extremes. The word *natural* is redundant; but we care not for this circumstance. We are intent only in fixing the mind of our reader both upon the truth and the importance of the proposition. We do not, of course, mean the individual mind—for some minds are naturally conservative—but mind in the aggregate, mind in its broadest sense. In this way we account for the singular phenomenon of what may be styled—not altogether inappropriately, as we think—moral epidemics. Sometimes a great tide of corruption will sweep over a community, carrying all before its resistless torrent. Again, the same neighborhood will enjoy comparative immunity from the grosser forms of vice, and experience something like a religious awakening. But the trouble is, that this last phase is about as unhealthy and abnormal as the first, if not quite so serious and hurtful in its consequences. Almost every man will be more or less influenced by the sensation of the hour. Hence it is that some places, most noted on account of their wickedness, become equally conspicuous in the line of religious radicalism. We but repeat history. The laxity of morals and discipline in the Anglican Church gave birth to Puritanism. Puritanism could not brook an altar, but it could burn a heretic. The wildest democracy is but the legitimate

offspring of the most galling despotism. The transition from Louis Napoleon to the Communists was both natural and easy. Society oscillates, like a huge pendulum, from one extreme side to another; and is seldom in the dividing line of truth, except when crossing it. Because the Cavalier decked his church with pictures and statuary, the Roundhead made war upon pictures and statuary every-where. Because the Cavalier invoked the swelling notes of the organ in the service of praise, the Roundhead fancied that he made an acceptable offering to God by consigning all musical instruments to the flames. We never heard of one of them, however, sneaking into a church, and, under cover of darkness, worshiping God by boring the organ full of holes. Because the Cavalier was attached to certain forms and ceremonies in his worship, the Roundhead, as nearly as possible, rejected all forms and ceremonies as offensive and profane. Thus one extreme begets another; and among the masses of mankind but few are able, either from the circumstances of their nature or education, to strike the golden mean—using the good things of this world as not abusing them.

Some narrow dogmatists seem to argue that, because a thing is susceptible of abuse, therefore it ought to be abandoned. At all events, there is little or no discrimination in their ill-conceived tirades, either *pro* or *con*. Ought a thing to be rejected because it can be abused? Let us suppose that this is really the question. And suppose, further, that we give to this question an affirmative answer. What then? Why, then, with a single flourish of the broom of intolerance and bigotry, you sweep from the face of the earth every thing worth living for,—the Church of Christ, marital and parental relations, eating, drinking, every thing. All these heaven-appointed blessings are liable to abuse—to the most shameful abuse. They are all abused every day; they have been perverted from the beginning; they will continue to be till the end. Shall we, therefore, destroy the Church? Shall men cease to marry and give in marriage? Shall eating and drinking be henceforth excluded?

But it may be replied that these things are all necessary; that they are really the very conditions of our existence; and that amusements are not thus essential. Well, this depends entirely upon what a man means by amusements. We admit the first part of the objection; but, in our view of the amusement question, we emphatically

deny the second. We deny that mental and physical pastimes are not necessary for the mentally and physically overworked man. They are necessary; and, furthermore, the treatment which this whole question of amusements has received from the hands of the Church, is altogether unworthy the gravity of the subject. Men act as though they were afraid of it. They cry, Down! but somehow it will not down. And the fact can not be gainsaid, that every day it is growing in importance, and every day it is getting more and more the upper hand of the Church. Presently it will have grown so big that the Church will not be able to handle it.

A man may manage to exist for a time without mental or physical recreation; but he in no proper sense lives. The best part of the man—the most susceptible and delicate part of his nature—is dead and buried, long before his body is laid in the grave. This class of men are juiceless as a dead tree. There is no sap in them. Keep a bow bent for a long time together, and it will lose its elasticity. As a bow, it will become worthless. So the mind or body, long bent to its task, however pleasant in itself the task may be, loses its elasticity and vigor, and becomes prematurely wrecked. Amusements should be chosen with special reference to the recuperative power which they will exert upon the wasted mental or physical system. A great deal is called amusement that is really not at all so. A man who has been using his brain during the working hours of the day, and, it may be, far into the night, should use his body when the hour of pastime arrives. What manure is to the exhausted soil, what rest is to the weary, hard-driven horse, amusement should be to the mind or body. Amusement is rest, in the best sense of the word. It is not menial drudgery on the one hand; nor is it undue, and therefore unnatural, excitement on the other. A man who has been thinking all day does not want to sit down to a game of chess in the evening; let the blacksmith and drayman do this. A man who has been doing brain-work for eight or ten consecutive hours, should mount a horse—a fast one, at that—and gallop over the country; that is, if he takes pleasure in it; otherwise it will do him no good. Should he prefer a game of ball or ten-pins, then let him elect accordingly. Let it be something that requires little or no thought, and in which he finds real pleasure. Our own preference would be to run a healthy saw-mill two hours every evening. Our impression is, that the price of lumber would

come down. Next to this, we should like to mount a locomotive, and make it spin at the rate of sixty miles an hour. To the sailor who has been on top of the mast all day, it would be amusement to descend seven hundred feet into a coal-pit; but it would scarcely be amusing to the grim collier, who has been down there sixteen hours, to return with him. He would rather take Jack's place at the top of the mast.

It will be observed that we are not considering the case of the worn-out debauchee, or the worthless woman of fashion, who alike waste life, and seek only excitement in amusement; but rather the hard-worked, toil-worn classes of society, to whom an hour's recreation of almost any kind is as the dew of heaven upon the hot and parched ground. For the former class, there is no such thing as healthful amusement in any proper sense; that which does not yield an unhealthy excitement is no amusement to them. For the latter class, any change, any relaxation from hard and grinding toil, will be eagerly seized upon; and, obviously, the majority of them will accept that which is most accessible. This accounts for the patronage which drinking-saloons, beer-gardens, and similar places, receive from the laboring populations of our great cities. Doth God care for servant-girls and apprentice-boys? We wonder if they think that He does? It is so easy, and so cheap, for well-fed, well-clad preachers, who ride around in the carriages of their wealthy brethren, and who have little or no need, to lift up their hands in holy horror because Biddy and Tom went to the dance or the theater last night; but Biddy and Tom will continue to go all the same.

For our own part—and let it be observed that we speak for ourself, and represent nobody—we can readily see how billiards, ten-pins (we dote on ten-pins), base-ball, and kindred games, may be made to serve certain classes of men a good turn; while we can scarcely find words strong enough to express our contempt for the man who will devote his life, or even a considerable portion of his time, to any of these games as a profession. It will be but a poor, sickly, wasted life at best. Let it be understood that we never read reports of base-ball games, billiard tournaments, etc.; and we sincerely pity the man who can take pleasure in this sort of literature. As for the theater, of all amusements concerning which we have any information, this would be our first choice; but every pure man feels that the best

defense that can be made for it is, to say nothing about it. That it has been handed over bodily to the devil, there can not be a single doubt. That it is sunk so low as to be past redemption, is admitted by the best and purest men and women in the land. This fact we deeply regret, nor do we hesitate to express our regret. That we could greatly enjoy the rendition of some of Shakespeare's immortal tragedies—to say nothing of numerous plays with which we are acquainted—we unhesitatingly admit; nor do we envy either the mental or moral condition of the man who is afraid of such an admission. That the depraved and vulgar taste of the age demands a style of performance which no person of refinement, not to mention religion, can patronize, is a circumstance very much to be deplored. The epoch that even tolerated such an exhibition as the "Black Crook" is said to be—for we never saw it—need not boast itself against the licentiousness that marked the decadence of ancient Greece and Rome. From all that we have been able to learn of the modern theater, we conclude it to be a place unworthy the support or countenance of any lady or gentleman; and that even occasional attendance on the part of a professed Christian brings reproach upon the cause of Christ. And we think our words entitled to the greater consideration from the fact that we come to the discussion of this subject with no narrow and ignorant prejudices. We think that we shall be heard.

We now reach what we will call, in no offensive sense, the *argumentum ad ignorantiam* of all who oppose the views herein set forth; that is to say, an argument based in ignorance of the facts. It may be briefly stated thus: The Bible does not in so many words condemn theaters, balls, gambling, etc., and, therefore, they can not be wrong. As this is, no doubt, with many, an honest objection, it deserves to be examined with care. In vain do we look into the Sacred Scriptures to find fixed rules concerning agriculture, manufactures, education, and many other interests of first importance to the race. The Almighty Maker has wisely left many questions to be determined by the wants, the habits, and the circumstances of life.

We look in vain into the Word of God to find specific enactments concerning many questions which deeply affect the welfare of man. Thus, no one form of civil government is enjoined, unless it be by example; in which case we are shut up to absolute despotism.

Whether we shall have a monarchical or republican form of government, is a question of which the Bible takes not cognizance. It only commands us to be good and law-abiding citizens in any form of government under which we may live. But whether our rulers shall be chosen by the voice of the people, or reign by virtue of their descent from a long line of kings, the Bible says not one word. Shall we conclude, therefore, that the Bible ignores civil government? This would be unwise. It gives only general principles, and leaves to us the details. The application of those principles is a matter of human wisdom; and the wisest and best men will have the most just and humane administration of law. The specific enactments of the Bible are few and simple, but they are such as lie at the base of all good society and government. The Bible was written, not for one age and people only, but for all ages and peoples; not for one society and government only, but for all societies and governments.

Now, some things are common to all peoples and governments; while the adoption or rejection of other things is to be determined by the governments and peoples themselves. Or, in other words, some things are fundamental, and some are not. One provision may be organic, another statutory. On the integrity and permanence of the former, the very life of the nation depends; whereas the latter may be changed, modified, or wholly obliterated, as the people affected by it shall determine. Thus, while the Bible is silent as to the form of civil government, it enjoins upon men the necessity of obedience to law and respect for rightful authority. And the reason for this is perfectly obvious: while it may make but little difference as to the particular form of civil government, it makes all the difference in the world as to whether we will respect it, and live happily under it; or reject it, and cast it aside.

Again: lying, theft, drunkenness, profanity, and murder, are prohibited among all civilized peoples, and under all forms of civil government, because they equally affect men in all states and governments. To be truthful, honest, chaste—these virtues are fundamental, and are essential to the welfare and happiness of all ages, governments, and conditions of human society. Will the foregoing reasoning be admitted as sound? Very well. The application is easy; and, in the light of this reasoning, we shall be able to test the soundness or unsoundness of certain objections now to be considered.

It is urged in extenuation of some species of amusements, that the Bible says nothing against them; and from this silence of the Bible is inferred the propriety, or at least the innocence, of such amusements. But this style of reasoning is both fallacious and pernicious: fallacious, because it assumes the very point to be proven; pernicious, because the assumption furnishes an excuse for unrestrained indulgence in all manner of worldly folly. The condemnation of many irreligious practices is to be found, not in specific enactments, but in general declarations of the Divine Law; as, for example, that law of universal application: "Abstain from the very appearance of evil." Here is an enactment of Jehovah that covers a multitude of the customs, follies, and employments of mankind. It not only condemns and prohibits that which is evil, but the very appearance or semblance of evil; and under this law, as Christians, we live. But here the question recurs: What is evil? Men are by no means always agreed on this question. Much less are they agreed as to the other question: What is the appearance of evil? A practice or employment will appear evil in the estimation of one man, and entirely innocent, not to say positively right, in the view of another. Here, now, is a conflict. Let us suppose that these men are equally sincere and conscientious—that they are, indeed, members of the same Church. What shall be done? Is there no way to adjust the difficulty? Is there no way to reconcile these parties without resorting to extreme measures? Must these men live and die in mortal antagonism, each holding the other as the enemy of public good? At this very point the majority of men have neither charity, forbearance, nor thoughtfulness. Let us try to discover where the real trouble lies. It is not, in the case we are supposing, found in the stubborn rejection of moral principle, or an indisposition to do right, on the part of either. Both alike desire to do right; each man is distinctly conscious of the rectitude of his purposes. The root of the matter must be sought for elsewhere than in downright perversity. Both men are anxious to do right, if you will but show them what the right is. The difficulty arises, then, from a misapprehension of the laws of right and wrong. Wise discrimination is necessary. Let us be careful here, lest we should wound where we would heal. Some things are necessarily sinful; their very nature is sinful. Some fruit is absolutely and unqualifiedly forbidden. Other

fruit may be taken in moderation ; but taken intemperately, wrested from its proper use and purpose, it is just as certain to produce death as that fruit which is specifically, and by name, prohibited. Now, even at the hazard of being misunderstood, at the risk of being evil spoken of, we intend to illustrate this proposition so as to make our meaning very plain. Take the subject of dancing, and *ab uno disce omnes*. As a mere abstract question of right and wrong, is dancing a sin? That is, is it prohibited by Divine enactment, as other sins are prohibited? Whatever may be the consequences of our admission, however fatal to our reputation with a certain class of most excellent but most unreasoning people, we emphatically deny that it is. We can not, we will not, stultify our judgment for the sake of appearing more pious than other men. We do not say that dancing, as a popular amusement, has not been made sinful ; we do not say that it is an amusement which may now, and among us, be innocently indulged. We say nothing of this kind ; for we mean nothing of this kind. We only say that, as a naked, abstract question, dancing is not a sin ; it is not a sin *per se*. If the mere physical act of dancing be a sin, then every person who dances is a sinner. Nor do we care any thing for the circumstances under which he dances ; he is a sinner still. Dancing being a sin, in and of itself, no possible circumstances under which it may be indulged can ever make it right,—just as swearing being a sin, every one who swears is a sinner ; lying being a sin, every one who lies is a sinner. Those sins differ from dancing—admitting for the moment that dancing is a sin—in this essential particular, that while dancing, in and of itself, is not necessarily and always sinful, profanity and falsehood are, always and every-where and in every responsible being, in and of themselves, necessarily sinful. There are, there can be, no mitigating circumstances which will at any time justify a man in swearing or lying. In all ages, under all forms of government, among all peoples, the specific enactments of Heaven prohibit falsehood and profanity, and render their practice sinful. But is the same thing true of dancing? We most ardently deny that it is ; and deeply regret that the incautious zeal of some religionists has rather retarded than helped the work of its extinction.

Truth has nothing to fear from honest investigation—or dishonest either, for that matter ; and, therefore, to the truth, and to the truth

alone, the advocates of righteousness should always appeal. Not to inflamed passion, but to truth—sober, heaven-descended truth—must we submit the arbitrament of every disputed point among us. We can gain nothing in our opposition to evil customs by assuming illogical and unwarrantable positions. This would be to strengthen the arms of the enemy. Let the issue be truly and fairly stated, and then, with great confidence, we may appeal, not only to the Word of God, but to men's enlightened consciences, to sustain us. Divine logic has no more sympathy for a false and untenable position than human logic has.

Then, there is a very large class of persons who take the following extreme position: Because God has not said, in so many words, Thou shalt not dance, therefore dancing is right and proper for every body. But this view is utterly inconsistent with the facts. While the simple truth can not be concealed that we shall look in vain for a specific enactment against dancing, it is nevertheless true that the liberty which a Christian man may exercise, in this as in all other matters, is limited in the Word of God. What, now, is this limit? Can its boundaries be defined? If not, then every man is simply a law unto himself, and may unrestrainedly indulge himself in whatsoever seemeth right in his own eyes. The present writer thinks that the limit of Christian liberty can be defined; and, furthermore, that the correct answer to this question must, among thinking men, who expect to answer to God, be an end of controversy. And, in his judgment, here is the true answer: Whenever a practice of any kind becomes inimical to the welfare of society, and shocking to the moral sense of Christian men, it has become sinful, and is henceforth to be abandoned; and that, too, irrespective of the silence of the Word of God. By this rule we judge public and miscellaneous dancing, theaters, and some of the popular games. But, as previously hinted, at this point we need a wise and patient discrimination.

The simple country dance of Germany and England, and especially the Germany and England of two or three centuries ago—the household or strictly social dance, in which such men as Martin Luther could, and did, participate—has, in our day and among us, degenerated into a gigantic evil; an evil, too, almost totally subversive of wholesome discipline in the Church, and destructive alike of piety and morality. But this is a wicked and most

shameful abuse of a good and pleasant pastime. That which is, in itself, as innocent as a promenade, has been so perverted and distorted as to have become a sin of huge and ungainly proportions; and no Christian man or woman, enjoying the unspeakable blessing of an enlightened conscience, will either practice it or give it countenance. As it is now generally practiced—in which phrase we include its modern accessories—it should be held as sufficient cause for exclusion from the Church of the living God. It conflicts with the general tenor of Bible morality; it is shocking to the moral sense of the best portion of the Christian world. As practiced in many places, and by many people, it is inimical to the welfare of society; and, therefore, it should not only be discarded, but held in execration by all right-thinking people. These several counts in the indictment can be fully proved to the satisfaction of any competent jury; only this is not the place to do it. And all this, and much more than this, is true of the theater.

If, now, what we have said on this subject can be construed into advocacy of dancing, then let it be so construed. We, at least, have had our say. But, in the mean time, we are profoundly penetrated with the conviction that this is the proper method to pursue in treating this, or any question of similar character; and not to try to make the Word of God say, in so many words, that which it does not say. As it is, a man thinks himself justified in his practice in consequence of the supposed silence of the Bible. But show that man his error; show him that it was not the design of the Author of the Bible to speak circumstantially and in detail on every subject; show him that, while the Almighty Ruler has not pointed out, minutely and by name, every thing that may, under certain circumstances, be condemned, still He has laid down a number of general laws; laws which inferentially take cognizance of all sin, sin in the abstract and sin in the concrete; laws which are modified in their application by the changes of governments, peoples, and customs; laws which, notwithstanding these possible modifications, and their occasional inferential character, are just as binding *where* and *when* and *whom* they bind, as the specific "Thou shalt do no murder." We say, show a man these things; and if he be an honest man; if he desires to do the thing which is right and well-pleasing in the sight of God; if he has a just regard for public morality and the

consequent welfare of society,—he must, it appears to us, yield with that quiet grace which is such an ornament to the Christian character. This is certainly the proper way to meet the difficulty; and if this eminently reasonable and, as we believe, Scriptural method fails, then we confess that we know not what to do with the question of Popular Amusements.

IV.—CHURCH ORGANIZATION *VERSUS* CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SINCE the time of the Protestant Reformation, in which the tyranny of Rome was first effectually broken, so that men could begin to walk in the light of reason and truth, and act according to their own judgments and consciences, the question of Church Government has not ceased to divide and trouble the Christian world. Whether it be that the teachings of the Divine Word, the ostensible rule of Protestant faith and practice, were found to be so obscure as to furnish no reliable indication of the Divine will; or whether the force of tradition and custom and prejudice was so strong that men were inclined to overlook the teachings of Scripture, or to pervert them into a correspondence with their preconceived opinions, the fact at least remains, that no satisfactory settlement of the question has ever yet been reached. Almost every conceivable form of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, may still be found in different branches of the Christian body; and each of these conflicting forms is claimed by its adherents to exist by Divine right, to be fashioned according to the model which was established by Divine authority, if not descended by regular and unbroken succession from the apostolic dynasties. It is important, however, to observe that the subject has thus far been treated chiefly as a question of authority—a question to whom the prerogatives of government in the Church properly belong; or, in other words, *who shall be greatest in the kingdom of God.*

We propose to apply to this troublesome problem the solution

suggested by the words of the Master to his disciples when their minds were heated by a similar dispute ; and as he said, "He that would be greatest among you, let him be the servant of all ;" so we say, that not only is he greatest who does most for Christ and his brethren, but that form of Church government which best *serves* the interests of Christianity is best entitled to our adherence and support.

The question, when viewed in this light, will be found to be one of *Church organization* rather than of Church government. It would doubtless have been well if the subject had been thus treated from the first ; but it would now seem that no alternative is left us. The latter question, if not settled in theory, may be regarded, in this country at least, as *virtually and practically* settled. In this country the power rests with the people ; and whether we call ourselves Episcopal or Presbyterian or Congregational, it is still the people, the aggregate membership, who are destined to have the controlling voice in Church affairs, whenever they choose to assert their power. For where the people are intelligent and free, there can be but one source of authority, whether in Church or in State. That source is the popular conscience and the popular will. Even Roman Catholic bishops have been repeatedly resisted and defied by Catholic congregations in different parts of our country, within the last two or three years ; and in whatever way such difficulties as those which have so recently occurred, at Auburn and Hudson and Williamsport, may be composed for the time, these cases at least show that the so-called Catholics of this country are beginning to know their power and their right, and afford additional confirmation of the truth that ecclesiastical despotism can not, under any system, long coexist with practical political freedom.

The result which has thus been attained is, in fact, but a practical triumph of the great Protestant principle of the supremacy of the individual conscience. *He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged by no man.* This principle, which was always true, always essential to a healthy Christian development and to effective Christian effort, is now so thoroughly established upon the foundations of political freedom that no assumptions of ecclesiastical authority, whether Protestant or Popish, can henceforth avail to unsettle or disturb it.

Huss appealed from the decision of the Council of Constance to Christ himself. The appeal did not save him from the flames, but was rather charged upon him as an additional crime. Hyacinthe, in our own days, has renewed the appeal with greater safety, if not with greater success; and the same appeal can now be made by any individual Christian against any form of ecclesiastical oppression, without danger to person or estate; and a bishop or presbytery can no more bind the conscience of the Christian who is true in his allegiance to Christ, and enlightened by his Spirit, than can the decision of a congregational majority or the decree of an infallible Pope.

As an inevitable result of this practical recognition of the supremacy of the individual conscience, it is plain that all *real authority* in any Church must be ultimately referred to the will of the aggregate membership. Church *government*, therefore, in this country at least, is and must be practically congregational, however we may deceive ourselves by theories and names, and whether the majority may show its power by coercing a bishop, or by constraining a presbytery or consistory, or through officers chosen freely and frequently from its own body, or by direct suffrage upon every question that arises; and there is no possibility that any ecclesiastical authority in any Protestant Church, in this country, can successfully assert itself in opposition to the judgment and conscience of a majority of the members.

The subject of Church *Government*, therefore, is practically removed from the arena of controversy. The question that remains is one of practicability and expediency—of the adaptation of means to the end. We are to inquire, not how the Church shall be governed, but rather what form of organization will give it the best practical adaptation to the work it proposes to accomplish; or, in other words, how shall we secure to it the most healthy internal life and the most vigorous external efficiency?

In proceeding to consider whether our evangelical Protestant Churches are or are not, in their organic form, well adapted to these ends, we are brought at once to the more ultimate inquiry, whether the present condition and prospects of Christianity are such that we ought to be satisfied with them. If the Church is satisfactorily prosperous under its present forms of organization; if Christianity is already, and without interruption or embarrassment, successfully

accomplishing its work in the world,—then, surely, we have no occasion to find fault with the means through which it works. If, on the other hand, its progress is retarded and inconstant; if its development is dwarfish and feeble; if its success is difficult and doubtful,—then it is more than probable that much of the difficulty is due to awkward and unskillful adaptation of the means at command, through perverted and impracticable forms of organization. For the resources of Christianity are constant and inexhaustible, and its possibilities, at least, are unquestionable.

The question for the moment, then, is: Are the Churches strong and healthy in their internal life, and vigorous and active in their external efficiency? Do they produce a generous and harmonious development of the Christian life within themselves, and are they rapidly extending the conquests of the Redeemer's kingdom in the world around them, so that they exist as positive, active, efficient powers in the communities in which they are located? In respect to what proportion of Churches and of Christians can these questions be affirmatively answered?

Opinions differ widely with regard to the present status and prospects of Christianity, according to the different temperament and surroundings and intelligence of those who hold them; yet it must be admitted that the average estimate is not very encouraging. It is evident that a wide range of observation or extensive information is necessary to an intelligent judgment; and there are two elements which must enter into the calculation: First, the average development of the Christian life of Church members; and second, the statistical reports of the increase of the Churches compared with the increase of the population.

There are, we believe, few persons capable of forming an intelligent opinion, who will declare themselves satisfied with regard to the first of these elements. Still it will doubtless be said that if the standard of Christian development at the present time is unsatisfactory, it is at least higher than ever before. This statement, however, is to be taken with a good deal of allowance. There is, doubtless, more education and more general culture among Church members than in any previous generation. The standard of external morality—that is, of respectability in society—is higher than ever before. But whether there is greater earnestness and depth in the prevailing

religious sentiment of society, or whether the distinctively religious culture of Church members is higher than in other periods; whether, in fact, the religious element is not often or generally overshadowed and enfeebled by the intellectual and æsthetic elements of culture,—are matters of the gravest doubt. The whole subject resolves itself into a question of interest in religious truth, and of the power of religion in the lives of men.

In regard to the first of these elements—namely, the prevalent interest in religious truth—we must look to the religious exercises of the Churches for our information. The sermon, however, will not afford us any very reliable indication; for, though the interest in it is not generally intense, it yet varies indefinitely, according to the ability of the minister. The Bible-class—not the Sunday-school, with its various devices to secure the attendance and attention of the children, but the Bible-class for adults—and the social meetings of the Church will afford us the readiest and surest indications of the interest of Christians in religious truth. Here we shall find the results of the Sunday-school teaching, and of all other religious teaching. If we consult these indices, we shall not have to wait long for our answer. Not more than one in ten of all the adult members of our Churches can be said to have any interest in either—certainly not enough to induce an attendance upon them—and in many a Church it is only with the greatest difficulty that these two institutions can be sustained at all.

In reference to the other element—namely, the power of religion in the lives of Christians—we have only to consider what proportion of their time, thought, money, and effort is given to Christ and his cause, and what proportion to the world, its comforts and luxuries, its extravagance and display, its style of dress and of living, to enable us to determine whether the prevailing sentiment among Christians is religious rather than worldly. There are many who will doubtless be ready enough to excuse the worldliness of the present generation of Christians; there are probably none who will deny that the world, with its ambitions and pleasures, its temptations and exactions, absorbs four-fifths—probably we might say nine-tenths—of the money and effort and thought of the average members of our Churches. Is it possible that there can be any respectable Christian growth under circumstances like these? The conversation of

Christians is not generally in heaven. Can it be that their treasures and their hearts are there?

In forming our estimate of the increase of the Churches from statistical reports, there are several particulars in which we are liable to error. First, we must remember that the object of rival denominations in these reports is to make a good comparative showing for themselves, and that many are doubtless counted as members of visible Churches who are not members of the Church invisible. There are some, also, who are faithful disciples of Christ, members of the Church invisible, who are not connected with any visible Church; but the former class is doubtless far in excess of the latter.

Again, we must observe that the reports furnished by the religious press of revivals, accessions, etc., are all on one side. We never hear of "backsliders," unless we hear that they are reclaimed. And as one would be likely to form an exaggerated impression of the immorality of a country from the newspaper reports of crime not counterbalanced by the manifold deeds of charity and virtue which properly belong to the estimate; so by reading the religious reports which tell only of increase, though they would perhaps generally satisfy only very moderate anticipations, yet the impressions we derive from them are doubtless often more favorable than a true knowledge of the facts would warrant.

Then, again, we must remember that the positive increase of the Churches must be compared with a very rapid increase of population, if we would know which is gaining upon the other. If the increase of the Churches falls behind that of the population, or only keeps pace with it, the result must be regarded as altogether discouraging, considering that Christianity aims at the conquest of the world. And in making this comparison, we can not go by the rule of percentage; a mistake which is very often made. If, for example, in a city containing ten thousand inhabitants, and whose regular annual increase is one thousand, there are ten Methodists or Baptists who, in the course of a year, succeed in converting ten others to their faith, it will not do to say that the Methodists or Baptists have increased one hundred per cent while the population has increased only ten per cent. It would be equally correct to say that the population has increased one thousand while the Methodists or Baptists

have increased only ten. The rule of percentage will not apply except where the numbers compared are nearly equal,—certainly not where, as in the present case, one of the bodies is seven or eight times more numerous than the other.

We can not, therefore, base our estimates of religious progress in this country upon the fact that the Baptists and Methodists have increased from forty or fifty thousands to four millions within the last hundred years; for the population of the country has increased over thirty millions, and Romanists have increased from a few thousands to five millions within the same period; and Spiritists have grown to the number of five or six hundred thousands, or, according to their own estimates, to over a million, within the last thirty years. The statistics of the Baptists and Methodists represent a very large proportion of the whole increase of Protestant Christianity in this country; and when the statistics of other denominations, and the various forms of irreligion, are taken into the account, it will appear that no very decided impression upon the religious character of the population has been made for so long a period, even if it can be shown that the relative proportion of Christians is greater than it was a hundred years ago.

And if the progress of Christianity is so slow, and so often interrupted as to refer the ultimate triumph to a period indefinitely or almost inconceivably remote, we can derive but little comfort from the contemplation. We should be satisfied only with a constant and very perceptible improvement, both in the relative number of Christians and in the standard of Christian attainment.

Keeping these considerations in view, it will not be difficult for any well-informed, observing Christian to form an intelligent opinion of the general condition and prospects of Christianity in this most favored of Christian lands. In the absence of more reliable data, his own observation and intelligence will supply him with all that is necessary to the calculation. He has but to remember that human nature, and the laws which control religious increase and development, are substantially the same in one state or section that they are in another; or, if there is any place or condition in which Christianity enjoys any peculiar advantage, or has achieved any extraordinary success, he will be certain to have heard of it; and can make the necessary allowance, if, in his judgment, such instances

of peculiar religious prosperity are not counterbalanced by others which are characterized by the opposite extreme.

In towns and cities which are subject only to the ordinary influences of growth which prevail in this country, it will be found that the Churches have slowly increased during the last twenty years. But the population has also increased, and generally faster than the Churches; and the religious influences which have prevailed, and which still prevail, are not generally so constant and powerful as the influences which are immoral and worldly. Licentiousness, intemperance, infidelity, worldliness, political corruption, are every-where assuming alarming proportions, and asserting a fearfully aggressive power; and all the forces of the prince of darkness are awake and active.

The Christianity of the day is not aggressive. The Churches stand timidly on the defensive, many of them seeming content if they can hold their own by securing a part of the natural increase of the families of their congregations, and gaining a few proselytes from rival denominations. Their membership is largely composed of weak, inefficient, dwarfish Christians, whose struggle with the forces of sin and temptation in their own hearts seems almost as doubtful as that of the Church with the world. They do not seem to understand their obligations and responsibilities, nor to have any vital appreciation of Christian truth; and the power of Christianity has received no very exemplary illustration in their characters and lives. This class is almost as numerous—shall we not say far more numerous?—than the living, active, consistent, efficient, growing, or full-grown Christians.

There are, doubtless, some communities and Churches which ought to be distinguished from the above general representation; and perhaps once in five or six years, upon an average, many of the Churches enjoy what is termed a "revival," in which for a few weeks every thing seems prosperous and hopeful; but they soon relapse again into their former apathy and inactivity, and prudent observers have learned that it is not safe to reckon more than half of these revival converts as permanent accessions to the Churches. Such we believe to be a fair representation of the general progress and prospects of Christianity in the most Christian of all Christian countries.

Take, now, a summary glance at the religious condition of the world. The Gospel has been preached upward of eighteen hundred years; and what is the result? Nearly three-fourths of the inhabitants of the earth are not Christians at all, but pagans or Mohammedans. More than two-thirds of those who are called Christians are so only in name, being attached to systems of embodied superstition and error which have always offered the most determined and stubborn resistance to the progress of a true Christianity. And of the comparatively small fraction whom we are accustomed to call evangelical Protestant Christians, how many are feeble, inefficient, ignorant, dwarfish, doubtful, having a name to live, though they are dead! And how many of our Churches—*rather, how few of them*—are healthy, vigorous, active, alive in all their parts, and existing as efficient powers in the communities in which they are located!

Yet this is the organization and the power which is to subdue the world to Christ; which has been attempting its conquest for the last eighteen hundred years—often for centuries together without making perceptible progress; at least, without materially increasing the relative proportion of Christians. It is doubtless true that, on the whole, a certain progress has been made; but it has been so slow, and so often interrupted, that it must be counted by generations and centuries, rather than by lesser periods, and great allowances are often to be made in the apparent results. There have been great apostasies, as well as great triumphs of the truth. There have been losses in one region to compensate for gains in another, losses in vitality and purity to compensate for gains in extension; and there is no one who will deny that the progress of Christianity, in these later times, has been always laborious and difficult, often doubtful and discouraging, and that the situation and prospects to-day are at the least exceedingly unsatisfactory. Indeed, no earnest, well-informed, thinking disciple of Christ can look abroad over the earth without a feeling of discouragement in reference to the condition and prospects of the Church. He will be obliged to fall back on the promises, to support his faith. Aside from these, and regarded either in the light of present prospects or of past experience, it would still remain, as says Professor M'Ilvaine, of Princeton, a matter of the gravest doubt whether Christianity is to conquer the world, or the world Christianity.

It is true that the modern missionary enterprise has contributed much, within the last fifty years, to brighten the general prospect, and to encourage those who are waiting for the kingdom of God; but if Christianity, when, after hundreds of years, it shall be established over the heathen world, shall be no more efficient there, as compared with worldly and immoral influences, than it is now among nations and peoples called Christian, we can, after all, derive no great encouragement from the anticipation. For the inefficient and unsatisfactory character of Christianity as it exists, even in the most favored of Christian lands, and the slowness and unsteadiness of its progress, are facts which are patent to every observer, and which, indeed, no one thought of denying until they began to be used as an argument against Christianity itself. Says Henry Ward Beecher, in his "Yale Lectures on Preaching:" "I think that one of the most humiliating things that can be contemplated, one of the things most savory to the scorner, and which seems the most likely to infuse a skeptical spirit into men, is to look at the pretensions of the men who boast of the progress of their work, and then look at their performances. I concede that there has been a great deal done, and there has been a great deal of preparation for more; but the torpors, the vast retrocessions, the long lethargic periods, and the wide degeneracy of Christianity into a kind of ritualistic mummery and conventional usage, show very plainly that the past history of preaching Christianity is not to be our model. We must find a better mode."

Nothing, indeed, has been more common than for Christians, all over the land, to confess and to mourn over the low estate of religion in the Churches. The very word "revival," in its common use and signification, includes within itself an indisputable testimony to the lifelessness and inefficiency of our average Christianity.

It has long been customary to explain the difficulty on the ground that Christians can not be induced to importune the Lord sufficiently, that he may pour out his Spirit for the conversion of men. The power, we are told, is altogether of God, and his power is at any time all-sufficient for the purpose, and there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few; *but he will be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them.* Then he will increase them like a flock. The whole case is here stated, as it were, in a

nutshell, and in almost the very language of Scripture ; and it would seem that all that is needed, is to secure a sufficient amount of faithful, importunate prayer.

This has long been the accepted explanation ; and the remedy it suggests has not only long been generally approved, but it has been adopted and put in practice about as far as it is ever likely to be ; and still the difficulty continues. We shall not quarrel with those who accept this philosophy, and we have no space here to discuss it. In reference, therefore, to those who adopt this view, and who are so fond of insisting that the Lord "will be inquired of," we have only to say, *by all means let them inquire*—using the Dictionary, if they are not quite sure of the meaning of the word. It is possible that their Christian labors may thus become more intelligent, and their results more satisfactory. At all events, nothing seems to be so much needed by this class of persons as inquiry at a source whence it is possible to obtain infallible responses concerning Christian duty and the methods of Christian effort.

For our own part, we believe, as has been intimated above, that a great part of the difficulty under which the Christianity of to-day is laboring, is due to its organization, or rather to its want of organization. The peculiarity of the present system is, that one man, appointed and paid for the purpose, and generally called in from abroad, is expected to perform nearly all the religious work of the Church. He supplies a succession of religious discourses—generally two, sometimes three—for each Sabbath, and on such topics as he pleases, together with five or six prayers, which he offers before and after the sermons. He selects and reads portions of the Scriptures, and selects and reads the hymns, thus indicating for the choir, and sometimes for the congregation, what they are to sing. In a word, he does all that is to be done in the regular assemblies of the Church, the people being listeners and spectators throughout. He has cultivated a style and habit of doing these things in good taste, in a becoming way. He has been trained and educated for the purpose ; so that the ministry, as it exists in the Church to-day, is as much a trade or profession as any other. The religious work of the Churches is thus remitted to a clerical order, of which there is room for one, and for but one, in each Church. The duty of the people is to pay the minister.

Every thing, therefore, depends upon this one man. The Church prospers just in proportion to his smartness; or, at least, this ratio is only modified by the fact that *one man* must generally be *very smart*, to make the Church prosper a little. With a minister of ordinary ability, the Church can hardly be said to prosper at all. Consequently, Churches, or Church committees, who are wise in their generation, are always on the lookout for a smart minister; and smartness in this profession is in such demand, and commands so high a price, that, unless Churches are wealthy, they can in general supply themselves but very indifferently with the means of religious prosperity.

But let us look a little more closely at the particular means and agencies upon which the Christianity of the present day relies for its sustenance and growth. What are the actual exercises and services of the Church, by which it is proposed to quicken and develop the Christian life, and extend the conquests of the Redeemer's kingdom? Attend an ordinary Church service, and observe. The people are assembled to improve one of the *two or three hours* which, at intervals of *once in seven days*, they are accustomed to devote to public religious worship. The minister enters the pulpit, offers his brief invocation, then reads a chapter in the Bible (the people, generally, attend), then reads a hymn, and the choir sing. The singing happens to be good, and the people seem to enjoy it; and up to this point nothing has been tedious. Then comes the "long prayer," which we need not describe. The people attend for perhaps one minute; but generally keep their heads bowed in a posture reverent indeed, but uncomfortable, even for sleepers. Some attend devoutly throughout, and are evidently edified and comforted. Probably as many grow weary and sleepy; while the great majority do not even listen to the words which are uttered, but think of something else; and are glad when it is over, so that they can sit upright again. The weariness is relieved by singing.

Up to this time, not much interest could be expected. Nothing has been tedious, if we except the "long prayer;" but nothing has been new, or calculated to arrest attention, unless the singing happened to be unusually good.

But now comes the chief feature of the service, that for which

all the rest was only preliminary and preparatory. It is the sermon, the main reliance of the Churches to-day.

The minister reads his text and announces his subject. All listen and attend. He commences his discourse with the attention of all. How long will the interest continue? Wait, and observe. He has been speaking five minutes. Look over the congregation now. Where are their eyes? Perhaps directed toward the desk most of the time. That is the natural effect of the position in which they are sitting. But there are a good many exceptions. Where are their minds? What an extensive and diversified panorama would be open to us, if we could see with their mental vision! Into what wide and diverse fields we should wander, if we could follow their thoughts! There are thoughts of business; there are incipient speculations; there are thoughts of social relation, of dress and fashion; there are admirations and jealousies; there are original fancies with the heroes and heroines and the absorbing events of the last novel; while many, who have no such resources at command, consider themselves simply "bored" by the sermon, which may nevertheless be a good one. The interest is revived, and wandering thoughts are called back, as the speaker relates an anecdote, or by some other device attempts to regain the attention of the people; but it soon droops again.

At length the sermon is concluded. It has lasted only forty-five minutes by the watch—much longer, however, if calculated by its effect on the people. Twenty minutes more would have made it a positive infliction, which the audience would have scarcely endured. Brevity is the best recommendation for the average sermon to the average listener. A brief prayer follows, there is singing again, and the people turn to go.

Observe their countenances now. How pleasantly they smile and chat! Where is the impression produced by the sermon? How long does it last? Notice their conversation on the way home. Sometimes they say it was a smart sermon, or a dull one, or a long one, or a short one, according to their general impression—the only one which seems to last them till they get outside the church-doors. Quite as generally, they say nothing about it.

Now, go through the whole congregation, and ask each individual

what the minister said. Perhaps one-half the congregation will remember the text, if inquired of the same evening; but in addition to that, you generally can not get one single point or thought. Some, however, will repeat a few remarks incoherently, and perhaps incorrectly, or mention the anecdote. The deacons, and some of the Sunday-school teachers, will do better; but there are not more than six persons in the congregation who will give you a coherent report of the discourse. The minister has brought out the result of a week's hard study and earnest thought. The people would not even give him their attention, when assembled on the Sabbath so that they had nothing else to do, and could do nothing else. If the discourse had been put in the form of a free public lecture, they would not have attended at all; or if they had, would not have remained till its close. Not one person in ten has received any positive, permanent impression from the minister's effort. Whatever impression they did receive, passed out of their heads as they passed out of the church; and during the six days in which they labor and do all their work, or in which they amuse themselves, and dress and visit and gossip, not a thought of the Sunday's sermon again enters their minds.

Is it any wonder that ministers are discouraged, who often labor in this way, year after year, without any apparent result? It is, perhaps, well that the ministers often imagine that their discourses are more effective than they really are; that they think others must be interested a little in what interests them so much. And it is doubtless true that the thought and effort necessary to prepare a discourse on any theme of Christian truth is generally profitable to the minister himself, whatever may be the effect on the congregation. There is that consolation, at least.

There are, indeed, exceptions to the representation which is above given as the average rule in our most favored Christian communities. There are ministers who can interest and hold the attention of their audiences through a whole hour, and who can actually impress the mind of the listener; and those who occasionally visit the churches where these men preach, can not fail to mark the difference between the earnest attention which they receive and the decorous listlessness which is accorded to the ordinary service and sermon.

But the inefficiency of our ordinary pulpit discourses, and the listless indifference with which they are received, are facts so apparent that it is no longer a service to Christianity to pass over them in silence. Henry Ward Beecher says, in effect, in the passage above quoted, that the kind of preaching which has hitherto prevailed has not been effective in the past, and can not be depended on in the future; and Dr. Bushnell bears similar testimony, in the following words: "*We ask, how often with real pain, Whence the remarkable impotence of preaching in our time?*" The fact itself is so apparent as scarcely to need the testimony of these eminent observers. No candid, intelligent man will attempt to deny it.

Besides the sermon and the Sunday service, we have the prayer-meeting, so called, and the Sunday-school. For the present, it is enough to say of the first, that not more than one in ten—in many cases not more than one in twenty—of the members of the Church can be induced to attend it; and for this reason, if for no other, it is a worse failure than the sermon itself. The Sunday-school, considering its limited scope and aim, is perhaps the most successful of the exercises of the Church. But even this is far enough from perfection. Its object is to instruct the children in the elements of Christianity; and these are often taught them, in the most superficial way, by persons who would not be regarded as fit to teach them Arithmetic and Geography in the public schools. But this is the best that can be done. The members of the Churches do not generally interest themselves in Christian knowledge, except in a superficial way. At least, they are not generally willing to attend the Bible-class, where it is sometimes attempted to pursue these subjects further. These are the ordinary exercises and agencies of the Christianity of our time. That they are exceedingly unsatisfactory in their character and results, no candid man, who has a tolerable appreciation of the nature and mission of the Gospel, will attempt to deny.

But let us not undervalue the Christianity of our time, nor the good influence it actually exerts, because it has hitherto failed of much it was designed to accomplish. Even in its present enfeeblement, it is indispensable to the progress and well-being of society. It has found a place in the civilization of the age, to which, however, it is in a sense subordinate, and of which it is a component element.

Churches and church-going, ministers and sermons, belong as much to the peculiar tendencies of our civilization as to any more positively religious principle. Yet, if the Sabbath and the formal and inefficient services above described were taken away, the people would doubtless go rapidly down the steep descent to infidelity and immorality. Still our Christianity is conservative and sluggish, not active and progressive; a secondary and subsidiary element of our civilization, rather than a positive and independent power.

Let us now take a glance at the original constitution of the Church, and see what provision was made, under the direction of the Holy Spirit—*not for the government of the Church*, but for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ; in other words, to secure to the Church a healthy internal life and a vigorous external efficiency.

Suppose a company of believers to have already been gathered by the preaching of an apostle, or other primitive evangelist. The first object to be effected will be the organization of these believers in such a way that they can take care of themselves, so that the Church they constitute may live and thrive after the apostle or evangelist by whose preaching it was gathered, has departed to carry the glad tidings of salvation to others.

We thus come, at the very first step, to a recognition of the fact that Christianity is endued with a self-sustaining power, by which a Church once constituted may have a vigorous, self-perpetuating life, an enduring vitality, to which the calling in of a minister or preacher from abroad was not in the least essential. It will be observed that the recognition of this principle was absolutely essential to the success of Christianity in its first promulgation, however it may be with its after-development.

In order to the healthy growth of the Church, and of its individual members, it is manifest that there will be needed a further development of the truth, the first principles of which have already been believed and obeyed. To this end, there must be instruction and instructors. Hence, we have a gift, or office, called teaching; and a class of men most competent to discharge it, called teachers, to instruct, not the children, whose minds are still childish and immature, but the adult members of the Church; and that not generally in the manner of formal, random discourse, nor yet in the

catechetical style of asking them questions and teaching them to repeat the proper answers. They taught rather *what the people wanted to know*, what they were *interested to know*. It was the people who asked the questions and expressed their doubts, the women only being forbidden to express their opinions and to propose subjects for investigation in the assemblies of the Church. The first condition of successful instruction—namely, the desire to learn, and an interest in the subjects of discussion—was thus readily secured. *A system of learning and teaching* is, then, the first feature to be noticed in the constitution of the apostolic Churches. This feature was universal, and was every-where regarded as indispensable to a successful Christian development.

Again: the truths taught were of such a nature as to awaken religious emotions, devout wonder, praise, thanksgiving, rejoicing. The expression of these sentiments in the public assemblies of the people, by those who had a peculiar experience of them, would evidently conduce to the edification of the Church. Certain men, in whom a high emotional nature was united with unusual facility of expression, were indicated by the Holy Spirit for this exercise. The gift of prophecy had thus a natural connection with that of teaching, and the two were frequently united in the same person. The former office, however, seems to have ranked before the latter, and the themes of the peculiar utterance called prophecy were not always the same with the subjects of instruction in Christian knowledge. They referred, perhaps quite as generally, to the dealings of God in his providence, to his peculiar care over his people, to his wonderful works to the children of men; and were, probably, in substance, not unlike the Book of Psalms, being, however, always fresh and original, and adapted to the peculiar circumstances of each particular occasion. Those who exercised this faculty were enjoined to prophesy "according to the measure of their faith;" and the possession of the gift implied such a faith in God as made the subject of it conscious of his presence and agency in directing the affairs of the world, and in controlling them in the interest of his people and his cause; such a faith as enabled the subject to see the hand of God in events presently transpiring, and in the daily dispensation of his mercies to his people; inspiring joy and content in the present, and an abiding confidence for the future. The vision

of this faith was occasionally, but not often, carried so far as to enable its subject to foresee and confidently to predict some particular event which God was about to bring to pass for the benefit of his people and the furtherance of his cause.

It is easy to see how an office which implied such a constant recognition of God, such a continual testimony of his presence and favor, would greatly assist the faith of Christians, and increase the power of the religious element in their hearts. There is room for such an exercise in the Churches to-day. There is, indeed, something to remind us of it in occasional remarks by ministers and others, suggested by what are termed providences—that is, by events in which the hand of God is manifestly discernible; but there is not that living faith in God, that constant and undoubting recognition of his favoring presence, which made the utterances of the early Christian prophets so effective for the edification of the Church. At first, the prophets spoke with tongues, declaring, as the Spirit gave them utterance, the wonderful works of God; but this was only for miraculous effect, and they afterward spoke only in the common language of the people, for their edification, exhortation, and comfort.

In addition to these exercises, we find that prayer, and the singing of hymns and spiritual songs, had a place in the public exercises of the Church. The first was always *brief and direct, simply the asking of a needed blessing*. Some words of thanksgiving and praise were, perhaps, generally added; but these belonged more properly to the form of utterance called prophecy; and there is no reason to believe that the ancient Church was ever afflicted with the nondescript exercise which often passes (among men) for prayer in modern times.

Singing, as being in itself calculated to express or awaken religious emotion, was employed in thanksgiving, praise, and rejoicing. Besides the usual singing of the congregation in concert, it was also customary for any one who could sing well, and who might have a hymn or spiritual song, to sing it alone; and we see no reason why singing, in this form, should not again be conducive to Christian edification and enjoyment.

The above includes, we believe, all the public exercises of the ancient Church, namely: teaching, including such questions, such

expressions of doubt or opinion on the part of the members as were calculated to call it forth, and give it interest and direction; prophecy as above explained, a most important and practical function; prayer in its true sense; and the singing of hymns and spiritual songs. Every function answered an actual need. Every thing was practical and practicable, and there was almost nothing to correspond with the lifeless, formal services of the Churches to-day.

But the ancient Church did not depend upon the temporary influence of its public religious services. Unlike the Church of modern times, it undertook, as far as was deemed necessary and practicable, a personal supervision of the daily lives of its members. This seems to have been a most important part of its work—that, indeed, for which the Church office proper was first and especially created. Those who had charge of this work were called elders, or pastors; and in this function we first come to an office of authority. Any one could teach; any one could prophesy; any one could pray or sing,—at least, any one had a right to try, subject only to the ruling of the elder who presided to see that all things were done decently and in order.

But, to control the conduct and habits of the members in their daily lives, besides the power of personal influence—that ability to manage men by the force of their superior character and judgment, for the possession of which the elders or pastors were chosen—it was often necessary to exercise positive authority. If any one, contrary to the paternal advice and admonition of the elders, persisted in evil habits, in frequenting lascivious public amusements, in squandering his money in hurtful self-indulgence, it was necessary for the elder, whose admonitions and entreaties were thus disregarded, positively to forbid him, in the name of the Church, and of Christ as its head; and to suspend him from its communion, if he did not desist. It was deemed a matter of the first importance to see that new believers should not be drawn away from their allegiance to Christ by evil associations and habits; and to see that their daily personal surroundings should be, as far as possible, such as would be conducive to their Christian growth. The elders were invested with the authority necessary for these purposes. They were, however, subject to the Church which appointed them. It was, indeed, the authority of the Church which they exercised over individuals;

and individuals, not the Churches as a whole, were exhorted to submit themselves to those who had the rule over them, as to those who watched for their souls and must give an account.

The Church undertook, also, to provide for its poor, to relieve the suffering, and, as far as possible, to minister to the wants of the needy in the world around. For this purpose, men who united a warm-hearted generosity and quick sympathy for suffering with practical, business-like qualities, were appointed to dispense the beneficence of the Church. These men were called deacons. Their office was, also, one of authority, or rather of public responsibility. It was not their own funds that they distributed, but those of the Church. This office was very important, not only in its direct results, as relieving human sorrow and want, but also from the fact that the hearts of many were thus opened to receive the truth. The deacons were also assisted by women suitable for the service, whose duty it was to minister to the wants of the needy and suffering of their own sex.

How was it possible that a Church thus constituted should not thrive? Its members had heard the preaching of the Gospel, and believed to the saving of their souls. They had formed a community whose bond of union was a common faith and hope and love. Their highest interests were in the Church; and in her prosperity they sought their highest good. They were eager learners of Christian truth. The subjects of investigation and instruction were always fresh and interesting; for Christian doctrine had not yet been brought to a "dead set" by the creeds and formularies of theology. The emotions which were inspired by the sublime truths of Christianity, or by the manifest presence and favor of God, and the evident workings of his providence unsealed to the eye of their faith, found free and fitting expression in prophecy, in prayer and praise, in thanksgiving and spiritual songs. The pastors, exercising a kindly personal supervision over the daily lives of the members, took care that none should stray into forbidden and dangerous paths; while the deacons, in the name of Christ and his people, dispensed the practical benevolence of the Church in such a way that all men might know that the mission of Christianity on earth was peace and good-will to men.

Can any thing be wanting to this Divine model of the Church,

as it came fresh from the thought of God through the voice of his Spirit? when all things were indeed made according to the pattern showed to the apostles in the mount of inspired vision? Can we wonder that Christianity so soon achieved the conquest of the world? that in less than three hundred years the head of the greatest Empire on earth had bowed to the scepter of the meek Nazarene?

But, with prosperity, corruption had begun to creep in. Men had been foolish enough, or careless enough, to lay irreverent hands on the Divinely appointed institution so admirably adapted to the work of Christ in the world; and the corrupting influences were greatly increased by the triumph to which we have alluded.

We can not follow the progress of this corruption which so fearfully disfigured and so sadly disabled the Church. It is enough for our present purpose to say, that its effects are, as yet, by no means wholly removed; that the Church, even in its best forms of organization, is still far enough from the completeness of the original model.

We shall next proceed to inquire how far the Christianity of our time fulfills, and how far it fails to fulfill, the above-mentioned Divinely appointed functions of the Church, endeavoring to indicate the inevitable effects of existing deficiencies, and considering in what way the original gifts and offices of the Church may be most readily and effectually restored.

V.—SUNDAY-SCHOOLS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE IN MISSIONARY WORK.

THE Sunday-school is one of the most important religious institutions of the age. In its most essential features it is the contemporary of every age. As a means of religious education to the large portion of the rising generation, of cultivating habits of ardor and obedience, by uniting together, by offices of good-will, the different classes of society, and of calling forth a large amount of self-denial, perseverance, and Christian principle, it is entitled to a high place. It is one of the most efficient means of extending the kingdom of Christ. Pure religion and undefiled, and the godly up-bringing of the young, have ever gone hand in hand.

It is important frequently to recur to "first things," "first principles;" hence, the attention is directed, first of all, to the

ORIGIN OF SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

To place your fingers upon the exact time and place when and where Sunday-schools originated, may not be the easiest task. It is customary to speak of them as exclusively of recent origin. The idea has gained extensive currency that Sunday-schools are the result of the superior wisdom and sagacity of modern times. But, as the subject is more carefully examined, the sentiment is daily gaining ground that the Sunday-school *idea* had its origin much further back than in the feeble efforts of Charles Baroméo in the sixteenth century, or Robert Raikes in the eighteenth century.

As we search the records of the primitive Church, and inquire critically after apostolic teaching and practice, we shall undoubtedly find, to our astonishment perhaps, something very much like the Sunday-school of our own time. The Sunday-school idea is most certainly prominent. It is true that Church history is not overflowing with facts upon the question; yet it is sufficiently full. The New Testament is not prodigal in its testimony in regard to its importance in its *conduct*; and yet the outlines of the institution are limned there. Early Church history, when it testifies, places the weight of all its evidence in favor of the institution.

The Lord's-day meetings of the apostolic Church were not simply gatherings of men and women—the young were there as well; and the very young were not forgotten in the holy ministries of the sacred day. The elders or other leading members of the primitive congregations—taking their example from the synagogue practice—taught the young and the old the “words of this life.” And, in all the Churches of the saints, specially where they were largely converts from Judaism, the general custom was to call the attention of the entire body to some one special portion of the Word of God.

Much is now said about the propriety of having a national or international “series of topics” for Sunday-schools, uniformity of readings on the Lord's-day; and this is called a “*new idea*.” It is not new; it is as old as the “Jew's religion.” And to this day, notwithstanding the mutations which the centuries have witnessed in other things once dear to that people, in all the synagogues of the Jews the same passage of Scripture is read and made the subject of study on the Sabbath-day.

Mosheim, in his “Church History,” speaks of *catechumens* as “an order” in the apostolic Church. He says:

“Whoever acknowledged Christ as the Savior of mankind, and made a solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized and received into the Church. But when the Church began to flourish and its members increase, it was thought prudent and necessary to divide Christians into two orders, distinguished by the names of believers and catechumens. The former were those who had solemnly been admitted into the Church by baptism, and, in consequence thereof, were instructed in all the mysteries of religion, had access to all the parts of the Divine worship, and were authorized to vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. The latter were such as had not yet been dedicated to God and Christ by baptism, and were, therefore, neither admitted to the public prayers, nor to the holy communion, nor to the ecclesiastical assemblies.”

Thus it appears, plainly, that the Sunday-school, in its substantial equivalent, was found in the primitive Church, and that it was a field wherein all the activity and enthusiasm of the entire membership of the congregations could be used in building up the Church of God.

THE MODERN SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

But, as a modern institution, the history of the Sunday-school is fully open to our perusal. To this part of the question the reader is invited.

In the year 1781, an individual of no great prominence in society went one morning to hire a gardener in the suburbs of the city in which he dwelt. In this part of the city the lowest of the people, who were principally employed in the pin manufactories, chiefly dwelt.

The man whom he went to hire was away from home; and, while waiting for his return, he was greatly disturbed by a troop of wretched, noisy boys, who continually interrupted his conversation. He inquired if these boys belonged to this part of the town. He was answered "that they did." The good man's heart was touched by their misery and their idleness.

"Ah! sir," said the woman with whom he was talking, "could you take a view of this part of the town on Sunday, you would be shocked indeed; for then the street is filled with multitudes of these wretches, who, released from employment, spend their time in noise and riot, playing at *chuck*, and cursing and swearing in a manner so horrid as to convey to any serious mind an idea of *hell*, rather than any other place."

This conversation suggested to Robert Raikes the idea of organized effort which, since developed and extended, has nearly "filled the whole earth." The entire history of the Sunday-school movement since then, is crowded with wonders. Others, before the days of Raikes, had conceived a similar idea; but he put it into shape.

The system of Robert Raikes had mostly to do with the poor children of his native city, Gloucester. He also employed paid teachers; and, from 1786 to 1800, the Sunday-school Society of England, of which Raikes was the acknowledged founder, paid for these Sunday services over twenty thousand dollars. That was *then*; but *now* the teachers employed in the Sunday-schools of our own or other lands, are working without money remuneration. It is a grand and noble work, and none but God's brave sons and daughters engage in it successfully.

The idea of conducting these schools by the employment of unpaid teachers is said to have had its origin in a meeting of zealous Wesleyan office-bearers, one of whom, when the others were lamenting that they had no funds for hiring teachers, said, "Let's do it ourselves."

In this effort of Robert Raikes we have what is commonly known as the "beginning of the Sunday-school system in Europe

and America." Be it so; its origin, in any event, was lowly enough. But lowly birth is no disgrace. Sometimes it is the highest honor that Heaven can confer. And as long as it is true that the "Lord of all" was cradled in a manger in Bethlehem, and the first exercise of the Omnipotence of Mary's son was in the presence of a feeble, unhonored few, a lowly origin may not be despised.

THE GROWTH OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IDEA.

The growth of the Sunday-school idea, like all other growths, has been gradual. The full-panoplied system of Sunday-schools of to-day was not the product of an hour. A century has almost gone since Robert Raikes toiled in Gloucester, and more than three centuries have passed away since Charles Borom  o, the nephew of Pope Pius IV, established similar schools in Milan, and among the wildest regions of the Alps.

To watch the growth of the simplest plant is not considered a mean business, even for a philosopher. To a mind capable of reflection, there is nothing of more interest than that which refers to the origin and progress of things in the natural, the political, the moral, or the spiritual world. To this business the profoundest intellects the world has ever known have given the bravest and best of years, fortunes, and lives.

By contrast, the immense distance between the *then* and *now* of Sunday-schools can be clearly seen. Then the little ragged, sun-burned, and desperately ugly children of the city of Gloucester were the almost sole attendants of these schools; then the teachers went to their work, the hired laborers of a man of means; then the educated people, the well-dressed, and the well-fed, laughed at the idea of helping these little ones and the Lord in this way; then primers and spellers were the principal books used—the Bible scarcely being used in these schools. But *now* the children of the rich and the poor are found upon the same platform; the teachers work for the love they have to God and "little children" and youths; the rich give of their abundance to sustain them, and the poor of their *hearts* to keep them strong; and the Bible, at least in profession, is made the only text-book, and the study of its pages is declared to be the supreme object of all.

Just here we are brought face to face with a sentiment expressed

near the beginning of this essay ; namely, that the Sunday-school idea is not a modern idea. The origin and progress of Sunday-schools furnish an illustration of the truth that many of the supposed inventions of modern times are but the development of ideas entertained in ages long since passed, but which have not been carried out into actual practice, or have failed at that period to exert any permanent or wide-spread influence. As a modern institution, the Sunday-school system was certainly feeble enough at its beginning. The effort of Raikes attracted but little attention, except in a limited circle. No Church would take it under its control or patronage. Individual men and women fostered what little strength it had, unaided by the organized religionists of the British Empire. But Raikes was not discouraged. He put the idea into a form which was distinguishable by "shape and limb." His teachers he hired ; but, in 1788, he had made so much of an impression on the wealthy people of the realm, that he wrote to a friend as follows : "At Windsor the ladies of fashion pass their Sundays in teaching the poorest children."

In 1785, William Fox, an earnest deacon in the Baptist Church, in Prescott Street, London, became a valuable co-worker with him ; and the influence of the Baptist body began to be felt in behalf of the new enterprise.

In 1784, the Methodists saw the value of the institution, and, with great energy, began to use its power and push its claims. In that year, their school in Stockport numbered 695. In 1859, it was the largest Sunday-school in the world, numbering 435 teachers and 3,781 scholars.

In 1796, the Quakers, under the leadership of Joseph Lancaster, first realized what they could do in the same direction. It is said of Lancaster, "that he was enthusiastic in his calling, and benevolent to rashness in his disposition ;" and of his school, "that it multiplied with great rapidity." Before he was eighteen years of age his school numbered ninety ; and afterward scholars came pouring in upon him like "flocks of sheep," till, in 1789, they reached one thousand in number. In order to furnish teachers for all of these children, he devised the plan of teaching the younger scholars by the older. In 1808, his school became the basis of what was then known as the "British and Foreign Bible Society."

About the same time, the "English Church," led by Andrew Bell, began to organize, according to the new method, exclusively "Church Schools." This finally resulted in the establishment, in 1811, of the "National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church." An outgrowth from this institution was the "Religious Tract Society."

In 1784, Rowland Hill opened the first Sunday-school in London. In 1787, the Sunday-school idea took root in Scotland, and soon developed into the "Edinburgh Gratis Sabbath-school Society." The schools under the direction of this Society were mostly conducted in the evening of the Lord's-day. Their object was "to promote the religious instruction of youth in the leading and most important doctrines of the Scriptures, and not the *peculiarities* of any denomination of Christians."

In 1787, Sunday-schools were established in Wales, in connection with the Baptist Church at Hengoel, in Glamorganshire, by Morgan John Rhys. This school was formed to teach the "Word of God and religious lessons only." Wales is proudly known as the "land of Sunday-schools." Carefully gathered statistics inform us that more than one-half of her entire population, from the cradle to the grave, are members of the Sunday-school. There it is no uncommon sight to see the babe on its mother's knee, and the aged grand-sire with hoary locks and wrinkled brow, employed in studying that Word which alone is able to make "wise unto salvation."

July 13, 1803, the "Sunday-school Union" of England was established.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS IN AMERICA.

Without sifting very carefully the evidence on the question, we may admit what is generally claimed, that to Francis Asbury belongs the honor of organizing the first Sunday-school in the United States. This he organized in Hanover County, Virginia, in 1786. We shall not take the space to present the evidences of the steady progress of Sunday-schools in this country since that time. It is not necessary. Suffice it to say, that the work has gone on until, one by one, all the Protestant religious parties of America have been imbued with its spirit, and, like battalions of warriors, have wheeled into line, as portions of the grandest army that ever shook this continent

with its marching tread, until no town, or city, or scarcely a country-place, can be found, where the white banners of the purest love are not carried by children's hands, and joyful hosannas shouted to David's Son by a myriad infant tongues.

STATISTICS.

A careful estimate, based upon official and unofficial reports, will show the following table to be a near approximation to the true figures:

RELIGIOUS BODIES.	Schools.	Officers and Teachers.	Scholars.
Methodists,	17,555	193,979	1,267,742
Presbyterians,	4,616	41,544	479,817
Baptists,	5,047	86,465	607,638
Episcopalians,	2,700	24,268	221,200
Congregationalists,	3,121	28,089	280,890
Disciples,	2,450	23,495	253,290
All other religious bodies in the United States,	17,365	187,000	2,327,400
England,	25,000	320,000	3,400,000
Wales,	4,500	38,000	420,000
Ireland,	3,300	35,000	240,000
Scotland,	4,100	39,890	380,000
Provinces of Ontario and Quebec,	2,800	25,000	210,000
Other countries,	5,300	52,000	540,000
Grand total,	97,854	1,094,730	10,627,977

In the United States alone, there are 50,854 schools, 584,840 officers and teachers, and 5,437,977 scholars.

The following table will exhibit, more in detail, the numerical strength of Sunday-schools controlled by the Disciples in the United States:

NAME OF STATES.	Schools.	Officers and Teachers.	Scholars.
West Virginia,	25	225	2,250
New York,	40	360	3,500
Missouri,	175	1,575	15,540
Kentucky,	300	2,700	27,000
Ohio,	315	2,835	33,000
Illinois,	345	3,500	45,000
Indiana,	550	6,000	65,000
Other States,	700	6,300	62,000
Total,	2,450	23,495	253,290

It is only a little more than four years since the Disciples took any steps toward an organized effort in behalf of Sunday-schools.

Since then, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois have perfected very efficient State organizations, and other States will soon follow.

Over the entire Sunday-school field, a wonderful activity is displayed. The Methodists report an increase, in 1871, of 643 schools, 4,567 officers and teachers, and 46,349 scholars. This, for a body that has been disciplined so well and so long, is a wonderful increase.

The Baptists, also, are wide awake. Their increase, last year, was larger than that of the Methodists. In 1870, they reported 5,251 schools, 56,515 teachers and officers, and 473,664 scholars. In 1871, they reported 8,047 schools, 80,461 officers and teachers, and 607,038 scholars; making a difference, in a single year, of 2,796 schools, 23,946 officers and teachers, and 133,374 scholars.

Other religious bodies have progressed at about the same rate. Even the staid old Quakers have caught the *spirit*, and do not sit so long without speaking as formerly.

The Catholics, in order to keep their children under their own better control, have also organized a large number of Sunday-schools, differing but little, in their general arrangement, from schools under Protestant direction.

The Jews, too, have their Sunday-schools; and their children are gathered together, not only on the Sabbath-day, but also on Sunday, for religious instruction.

The Mormons have found that in no other or better way can they so well resist the encroachments of the "Gentiles," as by a counter-movement in their so-called Sunday-schools. A few words here in regard to the Mormon Sunday-schools may not be uninteresting:

"The Mormon Sunday-school system is as complete as every other agency for Mormon Church extension and indoctrination. Every ward in each city, and every settlement in the territory, is supposed to have its Sunday-school, the superintendent of which is appointed by the president of the district, or the bishop of the ward. The Sunday sessions are usually in the morning. In Salt Lake City, they are at the same hour as the Tabernacle service. In Ogden, they precede it; and the schools, on closing, are marched in procession to the Tabernacle, to have a part in the worship there. The Sunday-school opening exercises consist of singing, prayer, and occasionally of Bible-reading. The classes are taught in the Mormon Catechism, the Book of Mormon, and the Bible. The closing exercises are, singing, prayer, addresses; and sometimes a general catechizing of the school from the desk. No pains are spared to fully instruct the children in the Mormon doctrines and belief."

Besides the doctrines of the Church, rules of conduct—some of them quite sensible—are given in “Jaque’s Catechism” (a book in quite general use in their schools), for the children’s guidance. Thus :

“*Question.* What does the first paragraph or verse of this Word of Wisdom teach us ?

“*Answer.* That it is not good to drink wine or strong drinks, excepting in the sacrament of the Lord’s-supper, and then it should be home-made grape-wine ; that it is not good to drink hot drinks, or chew or smoke tobacco ; that strong drinks are for the washing of the body, and that tobacco is an herb *for bruises and sick cattle.*

“*Q.* Why is it not good to drink wine or strong drink ?

“*A.* Because they excite men unnaturally, inflame their stomachs, vitiate their appetites, and disorder their whole systems.

“*Q.* Why are not hot drinks good for man ?

“*A.* Because they relax and weaken the stomach, and, indeed, the whole body.

“*Q.* Why is it not good to smoke or chew tobacco ?

“*A.* Because these habits are very filthy, and tobacco is of a poisonous nature, and the use of it debases man.”

If there was nothing worse than such teaching in the Mormon Catechism, it would be worthy of more general circulation and use. The children in the Mormon Sunday-schools of Salt Lake City are so thoroughly drilled in this Catechism, that they are able to stand an examination in it most admirably.

As for singing, the Mormon collections of hymns contain something of *trash*, with much that is of unexceptionable character. But this is also true of nearly every collection of Sunday-school hymns in use. It is not peculiar to Mormonism. Some of the best hymns of Watts, the Wesleys, Montgomery, and Cowper, appear in these collections. Here are a few specimens from “native manufacturers.” Undoubtedly, the critics of modern Sunday-school music will stand aghast ; but we can not help it. Our duty as a faithful historian requires us to say that, doggerel though it is, it is no worse in sound or sense than can be found in a large number of Sunday-school music-books now in use. A favorite, to the tune of “Tramp, Tramp,” declares :

“That the children may live long,
And be beautiful and strong,
Tea and coffee, and
Tobacco they despise ;

Drink no liquor, and they eat
But a very little meat;
They are seeking to be
Great and good and wise."

They sing with great vigor to the tune, "Aunt Sally:"

"While all the world is fretting about the future time,
At loggerheads are getting, the sight is quite sublime,
The Mormons they are growing in every thing that's good,
And Babylon is going down as they did in Noah's flood.
True saints rally; around the standard come,
Away in Utah's valleys, our lovely mountain home.
There's nothing can destroy us if we are firm and true;
Though wicked men among us, the Lord will trot them through;
He will not leave a grease-spot to mark the place they trod,
But hurl them to destruction beneath the iron rod."

In evidence of their parental love and childhood faith, they sing:

"The Mormon fathers love to see
Their Mormon families all agree;
The prattling infant on the knee
Cries, 'Daddy, I'm a Mormon.'"

Such teaching may not be of the highest order, but it shows one thing very clearly—the Mormons are fully awake to their religious interests, and they are evidently intending to be "great and good and wise."

The statistics and facts which have been presented, mainly relate to the United States; but it must not be supposed that here, only, the Sunday-school interests are advancing. Canada is as earnest as we are, and her Sunday-school system is as complete as ours. England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales are filled with enthusiastic workers in this wide, white field. There are very few, if any, better works on this side of the sea, on the Sunday-school question, than those of Groser, Inglis, Davids, and Reed. All of them are interesting, some of them are profound.

France has lately established Sunday-schools under both Catholic and Protestant patronage; and in the Germanic States many noble men and women have entered upon the work of teaching the Bible, on the Lord's-day, to all the children whom they can influence, as the surest and most direct method of staying the tide of irreligion and irreverence for holy things which, for so many long years, has been sweeping that beautiful land as with the besom of spiritual desolation.

Spain, too, the land of the Inquisition and the theater of nameless horrors, is open to the establishment of Sunday-schools. During 1871, many of these schools were organized under the direction of the "American and Foreign Christian Union." Thus the Sunday-school cause has advanced.

OPPOSITION.

But it must not be supposed that the effort which has proved so successful, to plant and nourish and develop the Sunday-school idea, has been allowed without opposition. Sunday-schools have always had plenty of opposers. The modern institution has had to fight for nearly every step of its way. The Sunday-school has been opposed as unapostolic, unscriptural, and, of course, wrong. Occasionally one has been found, who thanked God that "he was not like other men,"—*he* had no Sunday-school in *his* Church. Some have regarded Sunday-schools and Missionary Societies as alike "schisms" in the Church.

When Rev. Dr. Morrison and his fellow-laborers made the attempt to introduce Sunday-schools into Scotland, the ecclesiastical courts decided them to be "innovations;" and the cry "innovation," "innovation," was pealed from the trumpets of the opposition. The pulpits thundered their anathemas against them. Some of the preachers said that "the conducting of a Sunday-school was a breach of the commandment, 'Honor thy father and thy mother.'" Others decided, "that if any parent sent his children to the Sabbath-school, he should be cut off from the communion of the Church." Nearly every religious body has had its conflicts over the missionary organization and Sunday-school questions. The smell of battle has been along the entire line of march; but one of the most cheerful signs of the times is, that the day of battle over these questions, and specially the Sunday-school question, is almost over, and the season of tranquil labor and sure progress is near at hand. The following sentences from the Report on Sunday-schools of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church are worthy of calm consideration:

"Within a few years, the institution of the Sabbath-school has assumed such a form, and grown to such a magnitude, that probably but very few, even of the most thoughtful Christians, duly appreciate its unspeakable importance. Being

in the very midst of its developments, we do not so see its vast proportions that they leave upon our minds an adequate impression. If they were fairly grasped by our own Church at this deeply momentous epoch of her history, there is probably no other subject that would call from her more earnest and thoughtful consideration.

"When it is considered that the religious training of the young lies at the very foundation of every other institution of the Church, and of all that is hopeful in her future prospects, how can we overestimate the importance of this subject? The fact to which we dare not close our eyes, that so much of that training at the present time is passing over to the Sabbath-school and the Church, imposes such a weight of responsibility, that no amount of thought or work or money is too great to be bestowed upon this subject. Then its proportions rise up into additional grandeur, when we reflect that the Sabbath-school is the best known agency for reaching the millions upon millions of children who have no religious training from parents or any others, and saving them from godless lives, with all their disastrous consequences. Then, too, the Sabbath-school is pre-eminent as furnishing a plain and profitable field of Christian toil for every warm heart and willing hand. Will it do for our Church, in her organized form, to neglect this agency, which is springing up to such immense proportions within her and around her? . . .

"The work which the Church evidently should undertake in this matter presents itself in three branches:

"(1.) The first branch should include every thing pertaining to the books and all other literature that might be needed to give success to the work of Sunday-schools. A great evil that is creeping into our schools, and a great danger that is threatening them, arises from the vast number of books unsuitable for Sunday reading, and otherwise objectionable in their character. This evil needs to be efficiently guarded against.

"(2.) A second branch of this general subject should contemplate improvement in the standard of teaching, the purifying of our schools from every thing unworthy of the dignity of the cause, and the thorough development of the great Sunday-school idea. What can be done to increase the piety, the Scriptural intelligence, and the aptness to impart knowledge on the part of teachers, is the great question on which the true efficiency of our Sunday-schools depends.

"(3.) A third branch of this work of the Church should be the planting of new Sunday-schools in destitute places. We might expect every Sunday-school to become the center of salutary influences, and many to lead to the organization of Churches."

RELATIONSHIP.

The relation of the Sunday-school to the family, the Church, and the pulpit, is a fruitful theme. It has been difficult for many to decide what was their duty in the premises, because they were unable to satisfactorily decide this question. It has been held by some that there is *no* relation; and Church members, acting upon this idea, have concluded that they were under no obligation to work in or for the Sunday-school.

Others have taken equally extreme positions, but for different reasons. Strange as it may appear, good men have fought the Sunday-school, because, they claimed, it infringed upon the rights of the parent. Their argument has been: "Parents must bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; the Sunday-school proposes to do the same thing; therefore, the Sunday-school is a violation of the apostolic injunction—is wrong."

As this is an important point, we ought to calmly consider it.

"The family was God's first institution for man." Well; admit it. "The family, as a primal institution for the uprearing of a godly race, has ever been honored with the approval of its Divine Founder; and it stands, to-day, hedged about and protected by his ordinances, as Jerusalem is girt and shielded by its surrounding mountains." Very well. Does it therefore follow that the Sunday-school, either in theory or in practice, infringes upon its sacred rights? Certainly not. It is an easy thing to frame objections to any enterprise or method of procedure. It is not a difficult thing to find fault; and every thing good will, at some period of its history, be compelled to run the gauntlet of fault-finders.

Nearly half a century ago, Dr. Chalmers, speaking of the objections to Sunday-schools in Scotland, said: "There is none which floats so currently, or is received with greater welcome, than that they bear with *adverse and malignant influence on family religion*."

If these objections were well taken, and if the facts sustain them, then every well-wisher of his family or his race would be justified in saying: "Down with them! Let every Sunday-school banner be burned, and the whole system be buried too deep for resurrection."

But a critical examination of the subject will probably prove the above position to be wholly untrue, and the following more in accordance with all the facts: That not only has household religion extended its scope, and its standard been raised, just in proportion as the Sunday-school idea has made progress; but, also, that there has never been any systematic training of the young, except in conjunction with the Sunday-school, or its substantial equivalent.

The family, in the providence and wisdom of God, is incomplete, and hence insufficient, for the religious training of the young; and, therefore, an *exclusive* reliance by parents on household opportu-

nities for the bringing up of their offspring in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is unscriptural, irrational, and in the face of the experience of the Church of God.

It will also be found, upon investigation, that the practical question now is, not whether Sunday-school instruction conflicts with, or supersedes, family instruction, but whether it shall be Sunday-school instruction or *none at all*.

The Jews did not rely wholly upon family instruction for their children. They brought them into other gatherings than the family circle, for instruction in the "right way of the Lord." The children had a place, and received instruction, at the Church festivals of that people. In the synagogues, the Old Testament was studied—much on the general plan of the modern Sunday-school—by young and old together.

The Savior found this plan prevalent, in his day, upon the earth, and approved it. The early Church practiced it; and only in the sad lapse of the Dark Ages of the Church did the Church-teaching of children decline; and then, those portions of the Church which retained the pure faith continued firm in this doctrine and practice. There was probably never a time when the Bible-school, in some form or other, did not exist among God's people.

It is confidently affirmed that a fair examination of the religious condition of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and America, before and since the origin of modern Sunday-schools, will show that nothing like the present standard of household training, in these countries severally, was known before the Sunday-school was established. The carefully gathered testimony of history all points in this direction.

New England has often been summoned to testify what family training can do for children. But what are the facts? Is it true that the pious fathers and mothers of New England relied exclusively on family teaching or training? No. The Bible and the Catechism were taught in the public schools, and it was a part of the duty of the parish minister to catechise the young upon the Lord's-day.

Dr. M'Ewen, of New London, Connecticut, sixteen years ago, published a "Half-century Sermon," in which he says of the Church of which he was pastor, that, in 1806, "very little, if any, family

religion could be found. So far as a careful inquiry can be relied on, in but two families in this entire congregation was daily family prayer maintained; though prayer, Saturday evenings, was offered by *one* other householder, at the head of his family. Probably in two other families—perhaps in three—belonging to two other denominations, family prayer was, by laymen, daily offered." In other words, in *six* families at the outside, in all that town of New London, was there even nominal family worship. And those were the "good old days," for which many now groan in longing desire. And *this* is the family religion that the Sunday-school *might break in upon!*

How easy it is to underrate the present and magnify the past!

How true it is "that man, dissatisfied with the present, ascribes to the past a perfection which never existed, and which only serves to cover his chagrin! He praises the dead, out of hatred to the living; and beats the children with the bones of their fathers."

We are safe in saying that, whatever may be the limits of the relationship which exists between the family and the Bible-school, there is no antagonism between them. One is of God, and so is the other. God's plans never conflict. All along, from infancy to old age, he has arranged for every stage of man's progress. The triune agency of Family, School, and Pulpit—all included in the general scope of the Church—can alone be relied on for the religious training of the young. Neither of these parts is complete in itself for this high purpose. The blessed work of regeneration and culture is to be accomplished, in the wisdom of God, through the ministry of the Christian home; the pleadings, admonitions, and instructions of the pulpit; the discipline and experience of life; the meditations and Divine communings of the closet; the inspiring service of the social meeting; and last, though by no means least, through the diligent, prayerful study and teaching of the Word of God in the school of the Church.

MORAL POWER.

As a moral power, it is impossible to estimate the influence of the modern movements in favor of Sunday-schools. It is like the waves which wander forever on a shoreless sea.

The American Sunday-school Union was organized in 1824, in

the city of Philadelphia, Penn. Since then, it has organized over fifty thousand Sunday-schools in destitute neighborhoods and "frontier" settlements. It has gathered into these schools two million five hundred thousand neglected children. It can point to more than two thousand Churches, the outgrowth of its mission-work. For every fifty dollars given to the mission-work of this Society since it was founded, it can show at least one new Sunday-school organized by its missionaries, including the cost of publications donated. It has harmonized and secured the hearty co-operation of religious people of different names and creeds, in concentrated efforts to lead souls to Christ.

Had nothing more been accomplished than to keep these millions of children from the evils which beset childhood, for even a single hour of each week, it were well worth the effort.

SPIRITUAL POWER.

But more than this is done. Many of these children are finally "brought to Jesus," and their hearts filled with that joy which is "unspeakable and full of glory." Many of them become preachers of the Word, and the spiritual influence of the Church is largely augmented.

GENERAL INFLUENCE.

And who has yet swept with his vision the wide, wide field of the general influence of the Sunday-school upon the religious world? Who can say that it is not one of the potent agencies of God in bringing about the complete unity of his people in the earth?

May be it is one of the signs from Heaven, to teach the true disciples of Christ the way to higher, grander, and more united efforts in extending Messiah's Empire. Christians ought to be able to "discern the signs of the times." This movement in behalf of Sunday-schools appears to be one of them.

The sky is full of them. A few years since, some good men, who "feared God," prepared a programme of subjects which they desired should be made the burden of special prayer throughout the world, during the first week in the New-Year. This was the origin of what is now known as the "Week of Prayer." They

urged all Christians, in every land, to unite their petitions in behalf of these particular questions.

Now, what did this all mean? Multitudes did not know what it meant; hence they made it a subject of ridicule. Other multitudes, however, looked upon it as a "sign from Heaven;" and they prayed. It was one attempt at united effort on the part of the people of God. It meant this: There is division; there must be unity, or we perish. It was one of the "signs of the times." It was the red signal of distress. It was a *travail* pain that presaged the birth to a grander and more united life of the dear children of God.

Take another case, the "Young Men's Christian Associations." When these institutions were proposed, how many said, "This is the device of the devil!" Heartless sectarians said: "If these associations prosper, down goes the temple of our Diana, and the silver shrines which we have made for 'our views' will be no longer valuable." And they were opposed most vigorously. But what is the result? Now there is scarcely a city or town of any consequence, in this land, where they are not. Earnest Christian young men, united in a common work, are found every-where battling against intemperance and vice of every kind, holding prayer-meetings in unwonted places, filling dark dens with sweet song, and raising up to a new life multitudes of the degraded and sinful.

And this is one of the "signs of the times." It was found that no one religious party could or would do a tithe of the work to be done. Denominational jealousies, like hungry wolves, were on the track of every thing not begun by "our party" or "our Church." Hence, it was proposed to unite under the name Christian; and the associations were called "Christian Associations." And these associations were not due to the enthusiasm of a single, *alone* heart: thousands were waiting; and when the signal was given, they were ready.

But once more: It was an honor and a delight to attend the "Fifth National Sunday-school Convention," which was held in the city of Indianapolis, Indiana, April 17, 18, and 19, 1872. There were assembled a great multitude of noble men and women from twenty-two of the states of this nation, besides delegates from Canada, Ireland, and India. The motto of the Convention was the "Word of God" and the "Love of God." For three days they

talked of the Field, the Seed, the Sowing, and the Harvest. Not a word was said that was not in a spirit of reverence for the Word of God, and not a prayer was offered that did not *push* its petition in the direction of the unity of God's people, and that upon God's Word—"in Christ."

Now, what does this all mean? God's hand is most certainly in all these movements. They are "signs from Heaven." It seems that the power and providence of God are sweeping on all the religious denominations into one common Bible study. The nearly unanimous call for a "National Series of Bible Lessons" for Sunday-schools is in demonstration of this. This call is not by the voice of one, but of great multitudes.

The mission of those who love the pure Gospel of Christ, untrammelled by the creeds and devices of men, and who desire the union of all the children of God upon the Divine Word, is too much in the van of these mighty movements. Their *fate* will be to come in with the laggards at the end of the race, if they neglect their opportunities, or do not "discern the signs of the times."

IMPORTANCE IN MISSIONARY WORK.

If what has been said above, of the Sunday-school, is true, it would appear that no question could be raised as to its importance in missionary work. It only remains to specify a few of the many ways in which it may be used as a missionary agent:

(1.) It employs the unemployed talent of the Churches. In no other way can the membership of the Churches "go every-where preaching the Word" so efficiently and effectively as by this agency. It furnishes an opportunity for the young convert which will meet every demand of his first love and enthusiasm.

(2.) In the cities, specially, it is not possible to reach the neglected classes so well in any other way. Every city Church ought to have one or more of these mission schools under its control and patronage.

(3.) As a Church extension appliance, the Sunday-school has nothing superior to it. It leavens a neighborhood with the Word of God, and prepares the materials which afterward become the "lively stones" in the temple of God.

(4.) It unites the membership of the Churches in a common labor

for a common purpose. And there is nothing that makes brothers of us all, like working heartily together in a common good cause.

In a grave-yard, in Ireland, is the hill-side tomb of Daniel O'Connell. A traveler once stood looking at this humble grave, when right beside it he saw a mound covered with a cheap slab, on which were inscribed the words: "Sacred to the memory of Thomas Steele." The traveler remembered Thomas Steele; he had come to a sudden death for political crimes in England. Steele was a Protestant. The traveler turned to the old sexton, and, with a look of surprise, asked him: "Was not Tom Steele a heretic? Is this not consecrated ground? And Daniel O'Connell, was he not the son of the good Mother Church?"

"Faith an' he was, blessings on the Pope!" promptly responded the old sexton.

"Then why do you put Tom Steele, a heretic, in consecrated ground?"

The answer came instantly: "Why, you see, sir, Daniel O'Connell was for liberty; he was the great Agitator; and Tom Steele was for liberty, and he was a martyr: and *liberty makes brothers of us all.*"

CONCLUSION.

Among the old Romans there prevailed the touching custom of holding the face of every new-born infant toward the heavens, signifying, by thus presenting its forehead to the stars, that it was to look above the world into celestial glories. It was a vain superstition; but Christianity dispels the fable, and gives us a clear realization of that pagan yearning, in the deep solicitude which all its disciples cherish for the spiritual welfare of the young. The great design of the Sunday-school is to turn the faces of the children toward heaven, and prepare their spirits for eternal glory.

The noble workers in the Sunday-school "are planting seeds and saplings that shall flourish in noble forests, ages hence. Let them put in the ground trees that shall rise, cast broad shadows, and bear perennial fruit; and a thousand years from now, when they shall sleep in Greenwood or Laurel Hill, or on some battle-field, or in mid-ocean, they who live shall say: "Blessed are they who planted trees of such noble height, broad branches, and bearing such goodly fruit!"

VI.—THE REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

IT would be difficult to measure the chasm which would be produced, if all that has been said and done, *pro et con*, concerning Christ, could be stricken from the annals of the world.

Libraries without number would disappear; institutions of learning would sink, to rise no more; moral principles, pregnant with the most vital interests of mankind, would be blotted out; and the deathless yearnings of the soul for something better to come, would be felt only as the pangs of eternal despair. Who is Christ? what is Christ? what has he done for the race? what will he do for it?—are questions that will not cease to be asked while civilized man dwells upon the face of the globe. Be the Christian claims concerning him true or false, one thing is beyond dispute: his name has assumed more importance than any other name of earth; and he stands, in a broader and deeper sense than any other, a Representative Character. It is in this particular only, it is now proposed to consider him.

Paul says of Adam, he was the type of him that was to come. Types, however, are usually preparatory for something better—that is, more real. Adam, therefore, could not have been in any special sense the representative of the race, but simply the type of one who should be. Adam might represent the mortality of the race, but not the immortality. He might, and did, become, in a physical sense, the fountain of death, but could not become the fountain of life. He might be, and was, banished from the tree of life, and the race with him; but neither he nor any one of the race could return again to that tree. Morally, he was in no sense the representative, or federal head, of the race. He sinned upon his own responsibility, as all his children since have done; he no more entailed innate moral taint than his children are likely to do; and he suffered and died without being able to rescue one of his posterity from a similar fate, or leave precept or example by which they could rescue themselves.

A true representative is supposed to possess something in common with those he represents. More than this, he is supposed to be

able to do for them something which it would be impracticable or impossible for them to do for themselves. If sin and death and the grave, and the uncertainties of the (or a) future, can be said to compass the entire range of human capabilities and wants, then may it be concluded that Adam fully represents the race. But if a life of purity can be lived, if life can arise out of death, if light may shine upon the darkness of the grave, if the unseen may be the real, and an eternal future be made certain for the abode of man, then must man's true representative be sought among those capable of working out such a destiny; beginning with the minutest principles that enter into the incipient stages of human life; carrying them forward—here eliminating, there developing; here withholding, there giving—until the finite becomes more like the infinite, and the life of man like the life of God.

Who are so capable? Are men? If so, who are they, and where are they to be found? It is easy to assert that man possesses within himself all the necessary elements for development into a future and eternal life. It is equally easy to assert that the natural workings of the organic law of life will produce all desired results. But in the entire absence of a single demonstration on the one hand, or, on the other, the grounds of reasonable probability for a demonstration, he would hardly be called a wise man who would hazard all the possibilities of a future upon so uncertain a tenure.

If, for example, death is something to be dreaded; if the grave is not a resting-place to be coveted,—then it would be proper for those boasting of inherent powers to overcome death or its effects, and escape from the grave unharmed by its darkness or corruption, to give a demonstration of their power this side of death and the grave; for, surely, it may justly be claimed that a man in the full possession of health and all his powers, is much more capable of resisting death on its first approach, than of releasing himself from its grasp in the midst of the grave. But if it be urged that death itself works the metamorphosis, and brings by itself, from its own dark womb, the new and better life, then reason would that death should rather be courted than dreaded—rather loved than feared.

It is not enough to say that men instinctively shrink from death because they do not fully comprehend it. It is in the eternal nature of things, that if death possessed such magic powers, human

instinct would ever prompt toward it, as the natural appetite suggests proper food; and men would eagerly seek it, as they seek any any other known good.

But to say men shrink from death because they do not fully comprehend it—when it has, in fact, been always such an angel of love and light—is at least to say that some fearful Fate has, for the long centuries past, been eminently successful in making it an angel in disguise, and poor man the victim of immeasurable agony and suffering.

The truth is this: any principle of life or action becomes a law when it is well-nigh universal in its existence, and well-nigh uniform in its operations. The more nearly this uniformity and universality are reached, the more nearly is a positive or absolute law found. To set aside this, is to set aside the very foundations of law, whether of mind or matter, and reduce the world to chaos and ruin. Under such a law ranks death; and, by the force of such a law, all living things shrink from and resist death to the latest possible moment. If there be an exception to this rule, it will be, as will be presently seen, because some counteracting law or force exists, by which perfect assurance can be given of final relief, and therefore a partial abatement, at least, of present fear. Another truth may be stated: no human being, simply as such, has ever returned from the shades of *hades* to enlighten the world, or give proof that in those shades men are invested with greater powers over death than they possess in this world. This statement is made, too, in full view of all the claims of that latest delusion, Modern Spiritualism. Under the working of law so universal as that pertaining to life and death, in the absence of any instance where man, unaided, has given proof of the self-possession of a higher law, it is not strange that the eyes of the world, by common consent, are turned toward Christ. He alone has had the boldness to announce that he has traversed both worlds, and is Master of the laws in each. Assuming that his claims are correct—for it is no part of the present purpose to demonstrate them—the particulars in which he becomes the true representative of the race may be definitely considered.

I. A SINLESS LIFE.

The very statement of this may startle the reader into an immediate denial of its correctness. It is to be borne in mind, however,

that men are to be judged quite as much for what they may be as for what they are. It is man's capability of being or doing that must constitute the chief element upon which to predicate any expectations for his future. If the human race, as a whole, is to be taken only for what it is, its immediate blotting-out would be about the only sure remedy for its ills. But underneath all the corruption and degradation of human life, as exhibited in action, there are capabilities in the *nature* of man which ally him to the infinite. And though a man sin habitually and constantly, no proof is thereby furnished that his nature is sinful, or that his conduct, of necessity, must be sinful. Theology has seldom drawn a line between human nature and human conduct. The former is of God; the latter is of man. This is self-evident; for God created man, and not man himself. Whatever *nature*, therefore, man possesses, the Creator is responsible for. But in the fact that the Creator has so nicely poised man's ability to do or not to do, to sin or not to sin, is found man's responsibility for his own deeds. The Scriptures assure man, therefore, that he will be judged according to the deeds of the body—not according to the nature of the body.

If Christ lived a sinless life, he did it not so much by virtue of the special Divine power within him, or on account of the Divine nature he possessed, as he did it in human nature, did it as a man, to give proof that human nature is not in itself sinful, and that human conduct need not necessarily be sinful. It seems, indeed, impossible to imagine whence came the dogma of a sinful human nature, in the face of the fact that it was neither angelic nor seraphic, but *human*, nature, that Christ took upon himself. To attempt to evade this by assuming that Christ's nature was an exception, is a surrender of the whole question, since, in that case, he would in no sense be the representative of man. He either took upon himself human nature, or some other; if other, then is he in no way related to man, except by those Divine rights which were equally with God before the Incarnation took place. To what purpose, then, did Christ appear? Was his appearance only an apparition, looking like the human, but being only the Divine? Were his days of toil and sorrow, his tears and sweat of blood, and his tragic death, only seemings—only delusions? Does God thus mock the race, and attempt by optical illusions to win man to a higher life? Can God best illustrate what man

should be, by representing his Son what he is not? From such thoughts the soul sickens and turns away, only too glad to know that in Christ is found the true representative of human nature.

But another objection may arise upon the ground that, if Christ represents the capabilities of man, he must also represent the capability of sinning. It is difficult, of course, to show what might have occurred, when it did not occur at a given time, and that given time has passed, never again to return. Popular feeling, too, is very much averse to any attempt to study Christ as he was on earth. Christ in his glory and majesty in the heavens, Christ at the right-hand of God, has almost overshadowed the Christ of weakness, sorrow, and death, of earth. This is a dangerous overshadowing: dangerous, because men make their direct appeal to the Christ in heaven, to his power, to his mercy and love, for their immediate salvation at death, without having obeyed a single commandment he gave while on earth; indeed, affecting not to believe those commandments have any binding force for the present age. It will not be denied, but, on the contrary, shown in the proper place, that the Christ in the heavens is, there and now, also the representative of man; but the earthly stages must be passed before the heavenly are reached. Upon Christ's representative character with respect to capability of sin, it may suffice to recall the Scriptural declaration, that he was *tempted* in all respects as are men. Nothing can tempt or test men, unless they possess some capability of responding to the tempter's voice. The essential idea of temptation is, that one desires what he can, but should not, have. The secondary idea implies, therefore, resistance. Thus it is said that Christ was tempted or tested; but it is also said, he resisted. If he possessed no desires to be appealed to, if his battle with the devil on the mount or at the temple was only a seeming, then may the whole question of his temptation be placed among the illusions and delusions with which his whole life abounded, upon the hypothesis before referred to, that he really did not possess, and therefore could not represent, human nature at all.

The chief value of proffered sympathy, under circumstances of sorrow or weakness, consists not so much in the words spoken as in the recognition of similar mutual experiences. If Christ did no sin, yet he suffered on account of sin; if he did not yield to temptation,

yet was he subjected to temptation, and thus, by his own experience, knows how to sympathize with those who are tempted. The strongest appeal which the Scriptures make to the human heart, to look to Christ for the balm to its woes, is in the declaration that he was made like his brethren. The moment it is assumed that Christ's temptations were only a form, without the possibility of any sort of his yielding, that moment the strongest and most needed point of resemblance between him and his brethren passes away.

Let it now be inquired, How, or by virtue of what, did Christ live a sinless life? It may be answered, By self-watching, self-denial, and a supreme trust in God. In these there will be perceived no element but may also be brought into requisition by man. If Christ's sinless life was the (or a) result of omnipotence, exercised either by himself by virtue of his divinity, or by his Father, then he ceases to be, or rather never became, the exemplar for, or the representative of, man. Common human justice does not require impossibilities; and surely mortal man shall not be more just than his Maker. God could not, therefore, give the example of a life wrought out by his own omnipotent hand, and then punish his weak and feeble creatures for not imitating the example and living the life. But, under any conditions, can man live a sinless life? Undoubtedly so, under the simple conditions already named. The belief without hesitancy is affirmed, that the man who places a sleepless guard over himself, watching unto all self-denial, and never for a moment loses sight of his dependence upon and trust in God, will live a life unmarred by sin. That men do not do this, is by no means to be taken as proof they can not. Christ represents the human capabilities. Men, in carrying on the business of the world, are often thoughtless, sometimes reckless, often prayerless, sometimes faithless—that is, those professing to be Christ's—and the wonder therefore is, not that there are so few perfect men, but that there are so many good as there are. Did not such men carry about with them, in a greater or less degree, the consciousness that their elder brother knows the profoundest depths of their weaknesses, and is bound to them by ties of sympathy stronger than bars of triple steel, they would rapidly decline from good to bad, and from bad to worse, until all traces of a Christian life were lost. Again, it is important to observe, that sin is not

a subtlety to be detected only by the metaphysician, or precipitated by careful chemical analysis. It is easily recognized by those who are but casual observers. It bears with it, too, its own condemnation, the more severe, as it is in the more marked contrast with the life of Christ. Herein is the strongest needed proof of the representative character of Christ's sinless life, that man instantly recognizes any departure from it, and is supremely blest when conscious of approximating to it.

II. CHRIST MAN'S REPRESENTATIVE IN DEATH.

This may be comprehended in the two following particulars: Death with respect to the body, and death without sin.

Returning again to the history of the father of the race, it will be discovered that death, such as is designated by Paul a death by sin, occurred to Adam in the day of his transgression, as God had said. But the death of the body, nearly a thousand years subsequent, was only occasioned, not caused, by the first transgression. The banishment from the Tree of Life must be more immediately connected with physical death. In that banishment, it is to be conceded that the race also was banished. Christ, as the representative of the race, must therefore be just as far involved in that banishment as he is found to possess any thing in common with man, or in common with that part of man so involved. That Christ possessed, in common with man, a human body, must be true, if the human senses can ever be trusted, if human testimony can ever be credited; and, being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death. The obedience thus rendered, is demanded of all men; and of Christ, because he represents all men. But the death of the body is not necessarily the death of the man. As Christ represents not merely what man is, but also what he is capable of becoming; so in death he represents the power of ultimate triumph over death which may be imparted to man, demonstration of which having been given in that it was imparted to the man Christ.

In the second particular, the death of Christ is representative of man's, in that it occurred without personal responsibility. As before shown, the race was banished from the Tree of Life with Adam. Whatever sin may have led to this, still it is persistently to be maintained that the *act* of banishment was the act of God, and not of

man. To entail upon man, without his knowledge or consent, that terrible thing called death, certainly implies that God possesses somewhere in his realms of justice the means of assuming the responsibility of such an event, and relieving man from its dreadful power. This is precisely what is accomplished in the death of Christ. Stooping to the same depths, representing all men, assuming responsibility for all men, he tastes of death for all men. Just at this point mistakes are easily made. The human mind, often impatient of the plodding, prosy steps of logic, darts away like a bird through the air, and reaches conclusions at once equally remote from logic and truth. Thus, when the assumption on the part of Christ of all responsibility in a given case, is even hinted at, there are not lacking those who at once imagine he has assumed all responsibility in any case. Let such bear in mind, and note with peculiar emphasis, that there is no necessary connection between physical death and personal moral transgression; that either may occur without the other, and specially may death occur where the entire life and being are absolutely free from any and all personal sin, or any of its supposed taints. If the death of infants does not sufficiently demonstrate this, the death of Christ does. Whether the release of all men from the physical death, by their representative, will ultimately inure to their advantage, may and must depend upon the intervening question of their moral character; but certain it is, that the question of morals neither produces nor prevents the death of the body. Thus is Christ, in the obedience to death, in the freedom from personal responsibility and moral turpitude on account of which death comes, and in the capabilities of overcoming death, the perfect representative of the race.

III. CHRIST THE REPRESENTATIVE OF MAN'S IMMORTALITY.

Perhaps few questions in theology have been less understood, or more persistently misunderstood, than the so-called doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Seizing upon the Platonism of an early age, or the scholasticism of a later, men have sought to engraft them upon the New Testament teaching, as if Christ and his apostles had made them of chief importance; and thus Plato's doctrine of immortality has become far more current than Christ's. Neither Christ nor his apostles, in the true sense of the term, taught any

thing concerning the immortality of the soul. If the term soul be used in its technical sense, nothing could be said of its immortality; if used in the commonly accepted sense, nothing need be taught. For, in the one case, it must be regarded as the mere animal life, a result rather than an element; and, in the other, it would be tautological, to say the least—equivalent to saying soul soul, or immortal immortal.

The Scripture doctrine of immortality relates to *body*. It is the antithesis of mortality; and therewith must find its proper relations, and therefrom its proper outgrowth. It is affirmed of Christ, that he alone hath immortality. Perhaps no better reason can be assigned for this than that he alone possesses a body which was once mortal; as such died, but was brought to life, and changed to immortal. This is called Christ's glorious body; it can die no more; it is the true idea of immortality. The Scriptures make the attainment of that body their chief inspiration, and their most glorious promise to all of Christ's followers. Paul gives utterance to no fears about the death of the soul; but he evidently does dread to stand unclothed in the presence of God, and earnestly desires to be clothed upon with the new tabernacle, the immortal body, that, being so clothed, he may not be found naked. Paul enters into no ecstasies over the soul putting on immortality; but does break forth into most inspiring and rapturous songs of triumph, in contemplation of the coming hour when this mortal shall put on immortality, and this destructible shall put on indestructibility. This constitutes the swallowing up of death by victory. The reason is apparent. The body being the only mortal part of man, and therefore the only part subject to death, it follows, beyond dispute, that when the mortal shall become immortal, death itself must die for lack of other victims. Both Paul and John make the appearing of Christ the signal for the full realization of all this: the one declaring that at that time he will change our bodies, and make them like his glorious body; the other, that when he appears we shall be like him, and see him as he is.

But, as already maintained, Christ represents not more what man now is than what he is capable of becoming. In the great doctrine, therefore, of immortality, Christ becomes the representative of man's capabilities, and demonstrates that the mortal, subject to death, may become the immortal, and die no more. All life, however, is hedged

about with conditions, upon compliance with which the life depends. This is specially true of the question under consideration. Christ here represents not what man now *de facto* possesses, nor yet what he is by himself capable of becoming, but only what he is capable of becoming by the acceptance of Christ.

The question may, therefore, be briefly comprehended in the Scripture injunction: *Seek* glory and honor and *immortality*, and God will render eternal life.

IV. CHRIST ON THE THRONE—MAN'S REPRESENTATIVE.

The Roman Catholics, however at variance with a true practice, have kept alive, in theory, one of the most fundamental ideas of New Testament teaching—that of the intimate relation between man and his priest. It is difficult, if not impossible, for man to form any just or comprehensive idea of abstract spiritual being. It has not been said without something of truth, that every man is the measure to himself of the god he worships. This would undoubtedly be fully true, were there no means of approaching God save those of man's own discovery. Something of attribute may be inferred by physical manifestation, as something is known of electricity by its effects. But simply from physical effects to formulate a doctrine of the invisible, or from the real or supposed causes of those effects to infer the existence of spiritual life and being, would lead to as many gods as there are varieties of those effects. Still more difficult would be the task of unifying all invisible causative forces in a personal God. As Christ was the true representative of man, man-ward considered; so must he now in the Throne be equally so, God-ward considered. Christ thus furnishes on earth the modes of thought and conditions of life by which man forms his highest conception of God; this conception being a condition or state of life, rather than a form presented to the eye. As men learned, while Christ was on earth, to approach him—and the pure, or those seeking to become such, were freely permitted to approach him—so now in the Throne are men for like purposes permitted to approach him, with the assurance that they also approach God. As while on earth men knew whether they met his approbation or deserved his rebuke; so now may they know whether their lives are pleasing to him, and if to him, also to God.

In this phase of Christ's representative character men ought, therefore, by an unclouded, unstaggering faith, to be able to lift themselves so nearly and, as it were, so personally into his presence, as to have an ever-abiding assurance of his loving favor and his protecting power. The error of the Catholic, then, is not one of theory concerning man's need for intimate communion with and confession to his priest, but rather the error of persons and procedures. The reaction on account of this error, to the opposite extreme, has robbed Protestantism of the real germ of life, and the individual Christian of his main source of comfort and strength; has made prayer of little avail, and confession of sin a form of words; has destroyed faith in the providence of God; has left the Christian profession a body without a soul; and even under the plea of exalting and honoring Christ, has practically made of him an infinitely distant, unapproachable Monarch, who rules simply by his might, and who, if he knows much, feels but little of the woes and wants of men. In what bold contrast with this is the Scripture declaration that we have a High-priest who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities! This is not said of him as something he might have done, or did do, while on earth, but something that he can now do—is now doing. He carries to the very presence of God the ever-present consciousness of his own—and therefore of human—weakness and temptation on earth; and feels and knows, by virtue of his own earthly experiences, to what depths of sorrow men must bow, to what powers of evil men must be exposed, to what darkness and death men must at length yield. And if he received the homage of all created intelligences while yet his mission was limited to earth, what lips can speak the homage due, what tongue can sing the praises meet, when still in heaven and on the Throne he retains his representative character, and bears before the Father's face, with priestly offerings and mediatorial love—in all their strugglings after a higher life, in all their woe and want and sin—all those for whom he died? As the lowly Nazarene, or the Monarch of the universe; as stooping to death, or rising to live for evermore; as man on earth, or God on the Throne,—still ever and forever is Christ the Representative of Man.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*A Scriptural View of the Office of the Holy Spirit.* By R. RICHARDSON. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall, Publishers. 1873. 12mo. pp. 324.

THERE is perhaps nothing that marks more distinctly the decadence of Christianity in these modern times, than our fondness for discussing questions which are little more than hinted at by the Divine writers. This tendency, indeed, has been somewhat prominent in the entire history of the Church since the close of the apostolic ministry. It had even begun to manifest itself in the days of the apostles, and was severely rebuked by those inspired men. Still, certain phases of speculation have been specially fostered by the modern Church. Since the days of Augustine, Anthropology and Soteriology have largely occupied the attention of theologians, while many questions which agitated the Patristic Church have apparently lost their importance, and are now discussed only in works which are intended to cover the entire field of theology.

The Augustinian Anthropology made the modern orthodox view of spiritual influence necessary. Hence, while the Calvinian theology is not accepted by many, there are very few among what are called "evangelical Churches," who reject the Calvinian doctrine of conversion and sanctification. And it is not at all remarkable that such a view should obtain popular currency. For if Calvin's theory of the Divine government be correct, then it is scarcely possible to escape the modern view of spiritual influence, as a logical consequence.

But we started out by saying that all this speculation marks the decadence of Christianity; and we said so with the firm conviction that such is the fact. For instance, why is it necessary to contend for any special theory of spiritual influence at all? There is certainly no *theory*, as such, presented in the Word of God. We are distinctly told that the Spirit does this and that; but the *mode of doing* must be determined mainly by inference. We are told, in many instances, what the Spirit *does*; and if it had been necessary for us to know *how* this work is performed, we think this would have been plainly revealed to us in the Scriptures. But as no such

revelation is made, we think that any theory at all upon this subject is, to say the least, of questionable utility.

Here is where we think Dr. Richardson has made a mistake. While ably rescuing the Word of God from the hands of theological speculators, he has himself magnified some things, the superior importance of which is more in imagination than in fact. We call attention to the first two sentences in the doctor's book. He says:

"There is no subject more important in religion than that of the Holy Spirit. Unless this be properly understood, a large portion of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, must remain unintelligible."

Now, we do not deny that the subject of the Holy Spirit is of very great importance; but we respectfully suggest that to say, "There is no subject more important in religion," is putting the case entirely too strong. And then to say that, "unless this be properly understood, a large portion of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament, must remain unintelligible," is, in our opinion, to say a very questionable thing. Is it true that our knowledge of the Holy Spirit is equal in importance to our knowledge of Christ? Now, it must be apparent to every one that the subject of the Holy Spirit is involved in very considerable difficulties; and this must be so in the very nature of things. All subjects relating to spirit of any kind can scarcely be free from grave perplexities. This is doubtless one reason why "God was manifest in the flesh;" why our adorable Savior was "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." This brings the *Divine* within the comprehension of the *human*, and enables us to rest our faith upon something tangible—a sympathizing, loving Person, rather than an incomprehensible Spirit, whose known attributes have in them little or nothing to draw men as with the cords of love. Now, the New Testament is not a revelation of the Holy Spirit, as such. The Holy Spirit is wholly incidental and subordinate; is, in fact, the Divine agent in making the revelation—the *Revealer*, not the *Revealed*. The Holy Spirit, then, is important only so far as it reveals Christ, advocates Christ's cause, and assists Christ's people. To know this much is important, doubtless; but its importance is derived wholly from the fact that it is *more* important to *know Christ*. That the "subject of the Holy Spirit is, in many respects, difficult and mysterious," is freely admitted by Dr. Richardson; and any philosophy concerning the spirit in regeneration is regarded by him as injurious, and should be left to that "wise reserve" with which the Scriptures treat it. Now, is it not strange that a man who can make these admissions, will, at the same time, contend that this "difficult and mysterious" subject is equal in importance to any other within the whole range of religion, and attempt to give us a Scriptural view of spiritual operations, concerning which the Scriptures have said so little?

It may be that we are not sufficiently alive to the importance of the subject of Dr. Richardson's book, but we are profoundly convinced that there is not one Christian in a thousand who understands the office of the Holy Spirit, or ever will understand it, in so far as the *mode* of its operations is concerned; nor do we consider this necessary. Such knowledge is certainly well; for all knowledge is valuable, and this is of very great value. But what we say is, that it is not *necessary* to Christian character, nor even to Christian development. In fact, we do not consider a correct understanding, in *any respect*, of the offices of the Holy Spirit as necessary to the salvation of men. And our candid opinion is, that works written upon this subject have, for the most part, done more harm than good. Men are nowhere told in the Scriptures to preach the Holy Spirit, to believe in the Holy Spirit, or to obey the Holy Spirit, *as such*. And for the very best reason: the Holy Spirit is Christ's advocate; and any thrusting of itself forward into the foreground would vitiate its work for Christ. It can not, therefore, in the very nature of things, occupy any but a subordinate position. Dr. Richardson's view is, that it is the Holy Spirit which unites the converted man to Christ. Be it so. Still the Spirit's work is subordinate. It is work toward an *end*; and this end is the union of the believer with Christ. Hence, we see that, in whatever aspect we look at the case, the Spirit's work is to bring Christ to view. Now, we may not be able to comprehend the *Giver*; but if we heartily accept the *Gift*, we do not think we shall be condemned if we never, in our knowledge, get beyond this.

If, however, we *must* have works written upon the subject of the Holy Spirit, we are glad to have a work which, in the main, is of so much value as the one before us. Dr. Richardson has given us, in many respects, a remarkable book; remarkable for the amount of freshness which he has thrown into the discussion, and remarkable for the many original and striking views of passages of Scripture which he has given us. As the whole argument of the book mainly turns upon the exegesis which he has given of the Savior's prayer, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, we prefer to give the exegesis in the doctor's own language:

"This prayer accordingly, which Christ, at the close of his discourse, offered to the Father in the presence of his disciples, is, we affirm, *his promised prayer for the Holy Spirit*, embracing all the specified conditions and all the designed and needed results. I am not aware that it has ever been by any one properly regarded in this point of view, in which alone, as I trust to make it evident, it can be rightly comprehended. It is not a prayer for Christian union, in behalf of which it is constantly misquoted. It is not "the Intercessory Prayer," as theologians term it, darkening counsel by words without knowledge. Intercession implies parties at variance. Nothing of this kind appears in the prayer, or in the circumstances under which it was offered. There is no interceding for offenders in it. It is not intercessory in any sense in which all prayer for others may not be so termed. It consists simply of a statement of facts, and of those petitions which these facts warrant. The facts were not that the disciples had disobeyed, and that they

needed intercession, but the very reverse of this, as Christ declares of them: 'Thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and *they have kept thy Word*;' 'They have believed that thou didst send me;' 'I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou has given me, *for they are thine*;' 'I have given them thy Word, and the world hath hated them because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world,' etc. There is not a word in the prayer which could be properly termed intercessory; but, on the contrary, the attitude in which the disciples are placed in it throughout, shows clearly that they were regarded as entirely prepared to receive the great blessing, the burden of the whole prayer—that Divine *unity* which it is the office of the Holy Spirit to impart, and a prayer for which is equivalent to a direct petition for *the Spirit himself*."

That we have a right to expect that the Savior's prayer for the Comforter will be recorded, is inferred from the following:

1. The importance of such a prayer.
2. The usage of the Scriptures, in recording the fulfillment of all predictions which fall within the period embraced by the Scripture narrative.

It is further declared that this prayer was offered up in the presence and audience of the disciples, and was offered up for the disciples.

These reasons are illustrated with very considerable force, and it is very difficult to escape the conclusion at which the author arrives; namely, that it is simply a prayer for the Comforter, for which the Savior had promised his disciples to pray. Still we think the argument is weakened by attempting to support it with some rather fanciful reasons.

Assuming that his exegesis is correct, the doctor proceeds to notice the wrong use which has been made of the prayer, in supposing that it was made "in behalf of what is called Christian union; and that this 'union' is, furthermore, a matter yet supposed to be in the *future*; so that the prayer, in its chief petition, has remained heretofore unanswered." But the prayer is not for *union*, but for *unity*. These are declared to be very different things. "Union is the mere joining of two or more bodies in one. It implies a combination that is manifest, or that can be made manifest; but unity implies an invisible oneness: so that there may be a visible union, but not a visible unity." Union involves neither similarity of structure nor identity of nature; but "*oneness* supposes, so far as it extends, homogeneity, similarity, congruity, and singleness." Hence, it is concluded that mere union does not establish unity; nor does unity imply union. Hence, "visible union is never to be mistaken for that spiritual unity which, by the tie of a common birth from above, a heavenly parentage, a common nature, necessarily establishes a oneness, which, while it exists quite independently of external or visible union, nevertheless fails not to secure this, whenever intervening obstacles are removed, and natural attractions and affinities are permitted to exert their power." It is furthermore claimed that Christian union, in order to be worth much, must flow from spiritual unity; and that, in the order of time, this unity must

come first. It seems to us that the following paragraph is highly suggestive, and very valuable:

"Men have it, hence, in their power to preserve or to destroy unity, but not to *impart* it. They may establish *union*, but not unity. Nothing, then, can be more incorrect than to mistake this prayer, as is constantly done, for a mere prayer for union. Nay; it is often quoted as if really addressed to Christians, and as if it were an injunction to them to be united. It is said, 'Christians are commanded to be one.' No; never. This were, indeed, an impossible obedience. They are commanded to live in peace, as a condition of the continuance of the Divine presence; to be of 'one accord and one mind;' to 'stand fast in one spirit,' etc. All this it is in their power to do. They can be 'at peace' among themselves; they can 'live in peace;' but it is not in their power to establish *unity*. This is the office of the Holy Spirit; and, as God alone can give the Holy Spirit, Christ addresses his prayer to the Father, that this unity may be so effected. He does not pray that the disciples might be induced to form a union with each other, or with himself. This union already existed. He prays for that of which they were yet destitute, and which no mere union could supply—the 'unity' of the Spirit, the 'communion of the Holy Spirit'—which they were afterward enjoined to preserve by 'the bond of peace,' and warned not to impair by contention and strife. While union, then, can never *originate* or *constitute* Christian unity, partyism and dissension can do much to destroy it; for 'where envy and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work,' incompatible with the spiritual presence of 'the God of peace.'"

Passing over several things, which we would like to notice had we sufficient space at our command—such as, "The Baptism of the Spirit" (ably treated, but the conclusion questionable), "The Gift of the Spirit," "Fruits of the Spirit," "Fellowship of the Spirit," "Witness of the Spirit," "Intercession of the Spirit," "Means of Obtaining the Spirit," etc.—we come to the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters, which treat of the influence of the Spirit in conversion. There is in these chapters nothing that is specially new to those who have been accustomed to teach that the *Holy Spirit* is for the *Church* and the *Gospel* for the *world*. Still, it is doubtful whether this distinction has ever been more clearly made, or more ably defended, than in these chapters. The work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men is properly divided into two chapters: First, the influence which He exerts *from without*, in the production of faith and conversion; and, second, the influence which He exerts *from within*, as the Comforter, Helper, and Sanctifier of the obedient believer. This *ab extra* and *ab intra* view is claimed to be the only one capable of harmonizing the Scriptures and preserving the free agency of man. The following statement will give the doctor's view of conversion, at which point he is particularly at variance with the orthodox theology:

"There is no dispute, let it be remembered, as to the fact that the Holy Spirit imparts faith to the sinner, and gives him repentance, and leads him to confess and obey Christ. The point is, that modern theology attributes all this, and more, to the *immediate presence* of the Holy Spirit in the sinner; to an actual and a direct *impartation* of the Spirit, to enter into and purify his heart by a special and mysterious power. The gist of the modern view is, that this is accomplished by the personal agency of the Spirit, which is conceived to be essential, and the only thing essential, as is clearly shown in this, that the Word of

God is not deemed necessary to the effect; but it is supposed that this may be produced without the Word, which in no case is considered as more than a mere instrumentality, requiring an infusion of spiritual power, and as being, in default of this, inert and inefficacious. It is, thus, this mysterious operation, internal, independent, direct, and overwhelming—a spiritual baptism, an immediate outpouring of the Spirit upon the unbeliever in order to give to him true faith—that constitutes the popular regeneration, and the sole or chief idea of the Spirit's work in effecting the salvation of men. It is the sinner who receives every thing, and who is the subject of the only distinct and direct influence of the Spirit which the modern view admits; conversion being thus inextricably confounded with 'the gift of the Spirit,' which, according to this theory, is conferred thus upon the unbelieving world. . . . It is admitted on all hands that conversion is by the Spirit. The debate is upon the point whether the Spirit converts men by the evidences* of the Gospel presented to their minds, or by a special 'instantaneous work,' communicating faith by a supernatural power."

There are some things in Dr. Richardson's book which are open, we think, to serious objection, though, in the main, it is a work of great power, and will do good in correcting much that is false in reference to spiritual influence. It may be that the doctor has given us the "Scriptural view" only "of the office of the Holy Spirit." If so, we have certainly great reason to thank him. But just here is where the value of his work is impaired, in our judgment. We think that, along with the "Scriptural view," he has given us some things that may be fairly called *Dr. Richardson's view*. And, in so far as he has done this, his book is not to be praised above measure. Still, taken as a whole, we do not hesitate to say that, in our judgment, it is the ablest and most satisfactory work of the kind of which we have any knowledge.

The doctor's style is remarkably pure; and, while always characterized by an unaffected simplicity, it has the inspiration of confidence, and not unfrequently rises to a genuine and hearty eloquence. The work is intensely interesting, and will be read with as sharp an appetite as many works of fiction. The notes generally make a good point upon the subject under discussion, but their style frequently detracts from the main argument. It is a pity that some of them were allowed to appear.

The proof-reading has been very imperfectly done. We had noted a number of corrections that ought to be made; but we have not now space to copy them. It is hoped that a second edition of the work will soon be called for, and that then these slight imperfections will be removed.

-
- 2.—*The Forms of Water in Clouds and Rivers, Ice and Glaciers.* By JOHN TYNDALL, LL. D., F. R. S. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.

THE American Preface to the series of which this volume is the first issued, asserts that the rapid development of science, and the increasing

*The phrase "evidences of the Gospel" conveys, in our judgment, a wrong impression, since it is the *Gospel itself* that is the "power of God unto salvation," and not the "evidences" of it.—E.D.

public interest in its results, "make it desirable that the most efficient measures should be adopted to elevate the character of its popular literature." It then enforces the remark by referring to the wretched character of a good deal of the so-called "popular science," the work of careless and unscrupulous book-makers, who cater to public ignorance and love of the marvelous. It affirms, further, that "it is highly important to counteract this evil tendency, by furnishing the public with popular scientific books of a superior character." All intelligent friends of a sound education will heartily indorse both these propositions; more than that, they will support the attempt to gain those ends, here inaugurated, in so far as it gives promise, and keeps it, of actually gaining them. The attempt is simply this: An arrangement has been perfected, by which between thirty and forty scientific subjects, of great importance and interest, are to be treated by as many eminent writers, American, English, French, and German, in the same number of volumes; the whole to be known as "The International Scientific Series," and to be published by well-known publishing-houses in the four countries that furnish the works. In addition to securing a series of works of superior character as respects trustworthiness, fullness, and style, it is also expected, through the operation of international copyrights in Europe, and the enterprising liberality of Messrs. Appleton & Co. in America, to secure the authors a much better remuneration for their work than scientific writers generally receive—unless, indeed, they aid in the degradation of science by pandering to popular tastes. The idea is an excellent one; and we can hardly doubt that its execution will give the readers of three great languages, English, French, and German, the best set of hand-books they have ever had on the important subjects discussed.

Professor Tyndall, well known as one of the ablest of living natural philosophers, agreed to introduce the series to the public. "The Forms of Water," is the fulfillment of his promise. In passing judgment upon his work, it must be remembered that neither he nor his associate authors are expected to add to our stock of knowledge in the International Series; nor are they expected to compress into their books all that is already known concerning their several subjects. They promise no more than to present a judiciously selected part of our old stores, taking care, of course, that the latest results of investigation shall have their fair share of space. Professor Tyndall has added to our stock of knowledge; we do know more for his having lived; but his discoveries have been given to the world in his previous works. Here we meet him as the eloquent popularizer of scientific knowledge already in the possession of all men well-read in the natural history of water. His work abounds in that clearness of statement, felicity of illustration, and sympathy with science, which are found in his previous

works; for example, in his "Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion." The presence of an imaginary audience, from the beginning keeps the author ever alert and attentive. The work can safely be recommended to the class of minds for whom the series is more especially intended—not thoroughly read men of science, but men of active minds having scientific and literary tastes—as containing, in a most attractive form, all they will care or need to know about the four forms of water: clouds, rivers, ice, and glaciers.

There is but one point in which, so far as we can see, this series is likely to be open to serious criticism. Some of the writers may—indeed, are pretty sure to—go out of their way to show their hatred of theological conceptions in the field of science. No doubt some of the older philosophers were over-fond of introducing such conceptions—of discovering something wonderful, and growing pious over it; but that temper of mind has small sway now, outside of the poor popular works upon which the International Series is to be so decided an improvement. Professor Tyndall's book contains an illustration of what we mean. Count Rumford, called by the Professor "one of the most solid of scientific men," wrote an effusion, as was once the fashion, on the fact that water ceases to contract by cold at a temperature of thirty-nine degrees Fahrenheit—a provision which, as is well known, keeps the rivers, lakes, and seas, in cold climates, from becoming solid masses of ice. Rumford thought the fact exceptional, and he spoke of it with much enthusiasm as "a striking and palpable proof of the wisdom of the Creator," as an "interference of Providence which may well be considered as miraculous," etc. Now, subsequent discovery has overset the supposition that water is an exceptional case. Says Professor Tyndall:

"Water is *not* a solitary exception to an otherwise general law. There are other molecules than those of this liquid which require more room in the solid crystalline condition than in the adjacent molten condition. Iron is a case in point. Solid iron floats upon molten iron exactly as ice floats upon water. Bismuth is a still more impressive case, and we could shiver a boom as certainly by the solidification of bismuth as by that of water. There is no fish to be taken care of here, still the 'contrivance' is the same."

This is all very well. Rumford, were he living, would gratefully accept the correction, as we all do, touching the matter of fact. It may be well enough, in a book of less than two hundred pages, to devote two to the statement and refutation of an old argument pertaining to natural theology. But surely the following is unnecessary:

"I am told that, in our own day, there are people who profess to find the comforts of a religion in a superstition lower than any that has hitherto degraded the civilized human mind."

If we knew precisely what the Professor refers to, as we confess we do not, we might agree with him in calling it a "superstition," might agree in

describing it as lower than any superstition that has hitherto appeared among civilized men,—we might not. But, in either case, the whole paragraph is unnecessary, and is an offense to good taste, heathen as well as Christian.

- 3.—*The Great Problem.* The Higher Ministry of Nature Viewed in the Light of Modern Science, and as an Aid to Advanced Christian Philosophy. By JOHN R. LEIFCHILD, A. M., with an Introduction by HOWARD CROSBY, D. D., LL. D., Chancellor of the University of New York. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 12mo.

THIS is a book of positive value, not only because of the marked ability displayed in its pages, but because it meets some of the most important questions which are now agitating the public mind. We think no impartial reader can fail to see that, as to the modern phases of infidelity, Mr. Leifchild is master of the situation. While his style is remarkably free from dogmatism, and is sometimes even a little too reserved, it is quite evident that he thoroughly understands the phases of modern thought, and is perfectly competent to grapple with such men as Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, *et id genus omne*. The following extract will serve to show the author's freedom from ecclesiastical and scientific shackles, as well as indicate somewhat the spirit of the age in which we live:

"The present is pre-eminently an age of investigation, and of searching inquiry into fundamental beliefs; consequently, there prevails much doubt and much fear. Even in any one community of philosophical observers there are wide variances of opinion; and, as a president of one of the boldest and least reverent of our scientific societies recently remarked to the author respecting the tendency of certain researches, 'In all such matters, no two of us think alike.' There is, as there should be, unrestrained freedom of thought and expression. Every man says what he thinks and what he pleases about religions and sciences; and therefore, as previously observed, the utterance of individual opinion corresponds to the structure of the speaker's mind. Ill-informed and narrowly circumscribed men, who stand without, are appalled, and believe their lot to be cast in evil times. The remedy for this state is not to retire into narrow and still narrower limits, but to examine what is alleged, to see what really scientific basis it has, or has not. The march of science is in many respects a march of destruction, in order that it may subsequently become a march of restoration. If any man feels that he holds his religious opinions at the mercy of Science, if he believes only at the point of its sword, he lives an unworthy and valueless life. Baseless superstition is at the mercy of the sword of Science, and must be slain by it. Where, in the present day, it exists at all, it exists only by virtue of an armistice; its death is deferred only by the grant of a reprieve."

It will be seen by this that Mr. Leifchild is, at least, not afraid of investigation. He sees no danger to religion arising out of the investigations of science; but he will have no pretense. He is quite willing that every thing shall be subjected to the severest tests; but he has no more respect for dogmatism in science than he has for superstition in religion. Both must give way before honest investigation, and the result will show that

there is perfect harmony between true science and true religion. He further says:

"The higher ministry of nature is that by which she serves us as a hand-maid to religion, and becomes our servant in showing herself to be the servant of God. This, while it is her higher, so confessedly it is her more delicate and difficult, service. The mind requires to be trained to perceive it, and the spirit alert to receive it, before it will be available or interpreted. There is, indeed, a close analogy between the effort, the patience, and the perseverance of the physical discoverer or the mechanical inventor, and the research, the contemplation, and reflection required on the part of him who would spiritually profit by nature's teachings. Intimate acquaintance with the lives and labors of scientific observers, show how devotedly they have served nature before she usefully served them. In like manner, in respects of nature's higher ministry, every man must become her devoted attendant before she becomes his instructive teacher. If there be no royal road to Geometry, there is none to natural knowledge, and assuredly none to the higher knowledge of nature. In the study of this latter, pre-eminently we must exercise all our powers, and patiently and perseveringly pursue every clew and every path that appears to lead us to a favorable issue. Definite results in this direction are not easily attainable; while the inquirer is repeatedly baffled, and thrown back upon the insufficiency of his faculties. In this region, we are as children searching in the twilight, with an impenetrable darkness ever threatening us, and ever drawing closer upon us. Some one has suggested that, as seekers of truth, we are like wanderers in a large park, who delight ourselves in pacing numerous paths, beautifully bordered by shrubs and plants and stately trees, all of which, though alluring, nevertheless delude us; for, whenever we pursue any promising avenue to its end, we find ourselves stopped by a lofty wall, over which we can not look. Every-where stands the wall. It may be concealed by vegetation; it may be ingeniously hidden by woods and herbage; circuitous paths may be planned to keep it long out of view, to wile us into side-ways, and to beguile us with the imagination of unlimited space,—nevertheless, on all sides rises the wall; and we turn away, defeated in one direction, only to find ourselves alike defeated in another. The domain is on all sides bounded; our faculties in all directions are limited; we have only at best to explore what we can pace over; and, if we do that, we shall obtain the utmost results that our present liberty will permit. The time, however, will come when we shall pass beyond the baffling wall into the unbounded expanse beyond; and, in all probability, our acquired knowledge of the little paths of this world will qualify us for future explorations without limitation and without defeat."

This extract will sufficiently indicate the author's aim, as well as give the reader a taste of the quality of his style. The entire argument of the book is generalized as follows:

"This world of ours, and the universe, so far as we know it, form a magnificent manifestation to man, and perhaps to higher beings, of the creating and conserving Deity, without whose creation and conservation, in perpetual exercise, the totality of existing things, organic and inorganic, which we call nature, would not have come into, and would not continue in, existence."

In support of this view, it is claimed that every relation or law or method we discern and discover in nature, and in ourselves, as well as the advances and adjustments of scientific research, when rightly interpreted, all harmonize with this position. The various systems of metaphysics, and the physical or natural systems of recent date, are found to have inherent and inseparable defects. "Endeavoring to displace all theological considerations, they aim to interpret nature by herself; that is, nature suffices for her own phenomena without God." Against this view, it is argued

that "natural science and advanced theology are mutually and materially helpful;" and that "no physical genesis of the universe, in whatever form it may appear, will sufficiently prevail to destroy the great broad principles of Christian philosophy." Hence, "the exclusion of a religious and theistic interpretation of total nature is not logical, but dexterously perverse." Especially has the author endeavored to expose the emptiness of the "verbal abstractions which, though professedly metaphors, are yet assumptively endowed with personal qualities—with choice, with selective, formative, and constructive powers; and, notwithstanding, definitely represent nothing material or spiritual—nothing that can be a true and sufficient dynamics. They are presumed inherent powers of nature, which are entirely the figments of theorists. Whatever they represent is, when fairly interpreted, the manner and method of Divine operation."

It is a pity that a work that commands so highly our respect for its dignified, argumentative character, should be introduced to American readers by such a dogmatic, ungainly piece of writing as that of Dr. Crosby. It is evident that he has profited little by the book for which he writes so unworthy an introduction.

4.—*Oriental and Linguistic Studies.* The Veda, The Avesta, The Science of Language. By WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 418.

THE author of this solid book is well known as one of the most accomplished of American scholars, and one of the most useful of American educators. He has devoted his life to the study of some particular languages, as the Sanskrit, to comparative philology and the science of language; and then to the communication, in class-room and treatises, of what he has learned. We do not know that he has made important discoveries in either the narrower or broader field of his work. But this he has done: he has followed close upon the footsteps of the great German scholars, utilizing, in the field of American culture, the results of their researches. He has brought to this work of review and criticism, soundness of judgment, keenness of insight, and comprehensive breadth of view. His methods are cautious and thorough; so that, compared with the brilliant Müller, whose voluminous works he reviews with a trenchant pen, he may be said to represent a conservative scholarship.

The present volume is made up of essays and reviews contributed to various periodicals during the last twenty years. They exhibit the best qualities of the author's mind. A classification of the subjects discussed, more fully descriptive to the general reader than the one found on the title-page, would be, Oriental Languages and Literatures, and the Origin

of Language. In handling the topics embraced under the first head, he gives us partly original dissertations and partly reviews of such writers as Müller, Key, Oppert, Roth, and Muir; so that we get, to a considerable extent, the views of several well-known laborers in the same field. In the second division we have, first, a very careful and valuable paper on "The Present State of the Question as to the Origin of Language;" and then discriminating and able discussions of the "Simious Theory" propounded by Bluk; "The Physical Theory," maintained by Schleicher; and the "Psychological Theory," by Steinthal. American scholarship, to say the least, has produced no other discussions of these topics better worth reading.

The above classification does not provide for one of the ablest papers in the volume, the last one—"Language and Education." In this paper, Professor Whitney briefly characterizes the American system of education, stating in what culture essentially consists, and then throws his full power into a discussion of the position that the study of language must hold among the educational forces. The essay is in his best style. Where is there a paragraph that tells us what education is, in a better way than the following?

"Education is something essentially and exclusively human. There is nothing of it, there is nothing analogous with it, among the lower animals. These, indeed, have their powers gradually developed, but only by a force acting from within. Nature herself is her sole instructor. The old bird does not teach her young ones to fly or to sing. At the utmost, she watches with a degree of conscious interest the growth of their capacities; and the result is the same, whether they come forward in freedom under her eye, or in the confinement of cage and aviary. In man, too, there is a drawing out of innate powers. No one can be made by education any thing but what nature has given him the capacity to become; but it is through the process of instruction by his fellows, of communication from without, of appropriation on his part, under guidance, of the results of others' labors. That development which, among the less favored races of beings, reaches its monotonous height in each individual, has been in man a perpetual historical process, a slow and painful rise from step to step, an accumulation to which every generation between our own and the first fathers of mankind has contributed its mite, and which is still going on in the same way. The educated man is one who is not left to himself to discover and train his own powers, but is kindly taken by the hand, and led forward to the possession of all he can grasp and use of the wealth garnered by his predecessors. The sum of this garnered wealth we call *human culture*. To become endowed with it as his own individual patrimony, is the highest privilege, the duty of each individual; and to put him in the possession of it, is the aim of education. Education seeks to make the career of the individual an infinitely abbreviated epitome of the race, to carry him at lightning speed over the ground toilsomely traversed by those who came before him, to raise him in a few years to the height which it has cost them scores of centuries to attain. But the whole store of human culture, in all its constituent details, has long been far too vast for any one to think of appropriating; the utmost that can be hoped for is to gain its sum and effect, its most valuable results, and to be placed in apprehensive sympathy with it all, so as to feel its worth in one's self, and to be exalted by it."

The views propounded concerning the study of language as an educational appliance, and especially the views concerning the Greek and Latin languages, will hardly be dissented from but by two classes of persons—over-enthusiastic champions of the Old and New Educations, respectively.

Not often have we met a more temperate, thoughtful, and solid, though necessarily brief, discussion of these important questions. Professor Whitney intimates, in his Preface, that if the reception of this volume justifies it, he may publish another composed of essays on another class of themes. There is little question that the condition will be complied with. If the Professor has such a series of essays at all comparable in value with these, he owes it to American culture to give them to the press.

5.—*Interlinear Translation of the Sacred Scriptures.* With Grammatic and Critical Notes by Dr. LEONARD TAFEL, New York; Dr. RUDOLPH L. TAFEL, London; L. H. TAFEL, Philadelphia. Hebrew Text. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Boericke I. Tafel. London: David Nutt. 8vo. pp. 186.

THE work proposed, of which this is the first volume, ought to command the attention of Biblical students every-where. The object of its publication is declared to be, "to afford a ready means of obtaining an exact and thorough knowledge of the words of the ancient languages in which the Divine truths of the Sacred Scriptures were clothed, and thereby facilitating a correct understanding of those truths themselves."

The work is intended mainly for the use of those students who desire to know something of the original of the Bible, but who have not time to become thorough linguists; still it will be found to be very convenient as a work of reference for those who could do without it. The following is the general plan of this work:

"I. Above each word of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek texts will be placed an English equivalent, which shall render its fundamental meaning and grammatical function in such a manner as to enable any one familiar with the English Grammar to analyze every sentence of the foreign language.

"II. Words not found in the original, but necessary to complete the sense, will be inclosed in *brackets*, while the translation of such words of the original as would be omitted in translating into good English, is given in *parenthesis*.

"III. There will be appended to each number a body of notes, explanatory of the grammatical and other difficulties in the text. These notes will be paged independently, so that they may be bound by themselves.

"IV. In order to enable beginners to pronounce the foreign idioms correctly, we shall give, in the *first* part of the Hebrew, the Chaldee, and the Greek, its pronunciation and accent; Webster's key of pronunciation being adopted for this purpose, as far as it is applicable. In the subsequent parts, the pronunciation will be omitted, in order to prevent too great a bulk.

"V. In order that the student may soon acquire, also, a knowledge of the later Hebrew and of the Chaldaic, the Books of Ezra and Daniel will appear immediately after the third part of the Old Testament. Thus the student will early become acquainted with the new element that enters into the later Hebrew.

"VI. A succinct Chaldaic and Hebrew Grammar will also be given, together with a synopsis of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic verbs and nouns. This will be published as an Appendix, and separately paged, so that it may be bound by itself.

"VII. The Text and Translation of the Old Testament will be issued" in nineteen or twenty parts, that of the New Testament in seven or eight. Each part will contain about one hundred and sixty octavo pages, and fifteen or twenty pages of the 'Notes.'"

We regard the work, so far as published, as giving promise of a scholarly and valuable contribution to our sacred literature.

6.—*A Miller's Story of the War; or, The Plebiscite.* By One of the 7,500,000 who voted "Yes." Translated from the French of ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.

MM. ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN give us in this story a very realistic picture of the German-French war, as seen, not from the angle of the politician or soldier, but from the angle of the humble man of industry who had to meet the requisitions of the invading conqueror, and bear most of the heavy blows that fell upon the French nation. This point of view is well chosen. It is being more and more occupied by those who seek to show what war *is*, to the exclusion of that other point of view which discloses more of the pomp and circumstance of war, and less of the woe and suffering. Upon the French people who read this tale, the effect will be partly good and partly bad. It will be good in so far as it leads them to see the real condition of their country at the time when the Prime Minister said he went into the struggle with "a light heart." The incompetency and corruption of the imperial *régime* are laid bare with an unsparing hand. Its effect will be good, too, in so far as it leads them to see their responsibility for that state of things. But the good will be overbalanced, we fear, in the hatred toward the Germans, and the false confidence in themselves, that the book will nourish, if it do not engender. What the French need is, certainly not to cherish "just, fearful, unforgiving hatred." To be sure, Germany dealt hardly with France. But suppose it had been the French, instead of the Prussians, who crossed the Rhine; suppose the French soldiers had gone *a Berlin*, as they so glibly said they would at the breaking out of hostilities, instead of the Germans coming *a Paris*,—how would it have been then? We know of nothing in the history of French conquest that leads us to suppose they would have been more merciful. Then Badenese, Bavarians, and Saxons would have met the requisitions, instead of Alsatians and Lorrainers; and the art-galleries of the Northern capital would have been cannonaded, and, judging from the past, very possibly plundered. In the present condition of France, it may do no good to denounce Louis Napoleon; but it certainly will do harm to eulogize Leon Gambetta. The story is animated and sustained throughout, especially in bitter denunciation of the Germans. It should be added, that the translator has apparently done his work in a hurry; at all events, he has often slipped in his English.

- 7.—*Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects.* By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. I. American Edition. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1872.

THE author of these sermons is the foremost Catholic ecclesiastic in England. Like several of his prominent brethren in England and America, he was reared in the bosom of the Episcopal Church. He took part in the Tractarian movement of thirty years ago, and was borne by it into the Catholic fold. His present position attests the estimation in which he is held. He is an able, eloquent, and zealous prelate. All his writings that have come under our eye are composed in singularly excellent English—pure, simple, limpid, free from all ambitious attempts at eloquence and fine writing. These sermons are in his best style. He seems to know how to touch the springs of Catholic sympathy, as well as though he had been brought up in that communion.

Some of the sermons throw a side-light upon the evangelizing work and intentions of the Catholic Church; as, for instance, the one entitled "The Negro Mission." This sermon was preached on the occasion (November 17, 1871) of sending forth the first band of missionary fathers from the newly founded Seminary of St. Joseph's. Although this college was founded for missions to the heathen, it is significant that its first graduates were sent to the negroes of the United States. The preacher describes this population as "altogether exceptional." "In the heart of a Christian people," he says, with too much truth, "there are five millions of the negro race, who, the other day, were slaves. They may be truly said to be without pastors and without spiritual care. They are altogether an exceptional, I might say an isolated, race, in the midst of a Christian people." Somewhere, these fathers from St. Joseph's are now at work among our Freedmen. The Catholic Church builds for the future. The archbishop says: "We are now going to send into the United States a vanguard. We are taking up an advanced and advantageous position, for the purpose of acting not so much upon America as upon Africa." Here is faith, like that of Boniface and Augustine. In the future, the world will see what will come of it.

-
- 8.—*Yesterdays with Authors.* By JAMES T. FIELDS. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.

THE authors with whom the yesterdays were spent, are six in number: Pope, Thackeray, Hawthorne, Dickens, Wordsworth, and Miss Mitford. Mr. Fields had some personal relations with all of them, except, of course, the first; so that he writes of them, partly from intercourse with their works, partly from intercourse with themselves. Having been, for many

years, a member of the house that published the works of Thackeray, Hawthorne, and Dickens—having been an intimate confidential friend, besides—and possessing very respectable literary abilities himself, he could hardly have failed to say something about these three great novelists well worth reading. He was well acquainted with Miss Mitford, too; and had visited Wordsworth in his old age. Excepting the papers on her, the chapters appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, in the year 1871, as a series called "Our Whispering Gallery." They were read with general interest; and are well worth republishing in this more permanent form. The papers are partly biographical and anecdotal, partly critical. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the value of the book is in its reminiscence, rather than its criticism.

A large part of the volume is filled with letters. Many of these might better have been omitted. They were, no doubt, interesting to those to whom they were written, but are of no great concern to others.

-
- 9.—*A Manual of American Literature.* A Text-book for Schools and Colleges. By JOHN L. HART, LL. D., Professor of Rhetoric and of the English Language and Literature in the College of New Jersey, and late Principal of the New Jersey State Normal School. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Bro. 1873. 12mo. pp. 641.

THIS is a companion volume to "A Manual of English Literature," recently published by the same author. Both works are on the same plan, and have been edited with special reference to the wants of our schools and colleges; still, as a book of reference, to the general student, the arrangement will be found very convenient. The author has attempted to group the leading names of literature into periods around some representative heads, at the same time giving to each man his appropriate place in the particular field in literature for which he is distinguished. This method seems to us to combine many decided advantages, and Professor Hart has not failed to make it a prominent feature in his works.

The "Manual of American Literature" is not as discriminating as we could wish, in the selection of either the minor or representative authors. We can think of a large number of names that ought to have appeared, while we notice a number in the book that have little or no claims to such a position. But this is, to some extent, unavoidable, especially in a book which, for the most part, is a pioneer work. Doubtless these matters will be largely adjusted in subsequent editions.

We notice a number of mistakes, also, into which the author has fallen. We can now refer to only one or two. The death of Alexander Campbell is put down as having occurred in 1855, whereas it occurred in 1866. It is also stated that Dr. R. Richardson is President of Bethany

College, and a "disciple of A. Campbell." Of course, these are small matters compared with the general value of the work; but accuracy in a book of this kind is of great importance. Bating the classes of exceptions noted, the work is a valuable contribution to our text-book literature.

-
- 10.—*Fifteen Years of Prayer in the Fulton-street Meeting.* By S. IRENÆUS PRIME. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 345.

At a time like this, when the "prayer-gauge" question is receiving so much attention, it is well to have a book directly in print; and if the volume before us is to be accepted as veritable history, then Professor Tyndall, if he does not wish his scientific theories exploded, had better keep away from the Fulton-street prayer-meeting.

We confess that this book is a little too much for us. We have never for once questioned the efficacy of prayer; but we can not hope to make others believe in this doctrine, if we involve it in a class of supposed facts which clearly contradict the teachings of the Bible.

It has not been long since we attended a meeting similar to this Fulton-street prayer-meeting. Requests were handed in by anxious ones, asking special prayer on behalf of husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers. One distinguished minister related, in substance, the following: A lady, for whose conversion he had been praying earnestly, met him on the street, and told him that she had experienced very strange feelings during the past three or four days. She then described minutely the character of these feelings, when the minister exclaimed, "My dear sister, you are converted—converted in answer to prayer." Now, we believe in special providences, and also in the efficacy of prayer; but such a story as this is not calculated to strengthen our faith in either to any great degree. The absurdity of any one being converted for two or three days without knowing it, is too glaring for any but those who are blinded by a theory which makes possible such things.

There are many things in Mr. Prime's book that are worth preserving; but we doubt whether, as a whole, its influence will be for good.

-
- 11.—*On the Rock; or, Truth Stranger than Fiction. A Story of Souls whose pathway began in darkness, but brightened to the perfect day.* By D. R. DUNGAN. Oskaloosa, Iowa: Call, Bristol & Co. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall. 1872. 12mo. pp. 358.

THIS is a well-deserving effort to bring certain theological discussions within the range of the masses. It is written in the form of a dialogue; and, like all writing of this kind, when controverted opinions are involved,

is open to grave objections. A few days ago, we noticed our little boy playing marbles. He was by himself; but, in order to compensate for this fact, he used three marbles representing, respectively, himself and two other boys. He did all the playing for the three, and it was evident to our mind that he aimed to do the fair thing for his ideal opponents; but, somehow or other, *his marble won all the games*. Now, precisely so is it with ideal opponents in religious controversies. When one man has to do all the shooting, he will be sure to win all the games. In other words, when he sets up his opponents, he is certain to do it so he can hit them in fatal places. And why not, since he knows precisely where he is going to hit them before he sets them up?

The style of Mr. Dungan's book is exceedingly simple, and often quite forcible. With the class of people for whom it was written, it will scarcely fail to do much good.

-
- 12.—*The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. crown. pp. 638.

A work like this, coming from the source it does, would attract attention at any time, but just now it is likely to produce almost a sensation. The author's lectures "On Ireland," since his arrival in this country, the reply to these lectures by various persons, and especially Father Burke, will excite great curiosity to see Mr. Froude's more deliberate utterances and the sources of his information, as found in his history of Ireland. No one will, for a moment, question Mr. Froude's ability. Many of his positions will doubtless be very severely criticised, but it is by no means certain that his trustworthiness as a historian will be seriously impaired. In the arena of polemics he may not be the equal of Father Burke, especially before a popular audience; but this sort of ability is not necessary to enable him to write truthful history. In our judgment, Froude's "History of Ireland" will continue to be a standard work when the lectures of such men as Father Burke, Wendell Phillips, etc., are wholly forgotten.

-
- 13.—*The Psalms*. By CARL BERNHARD MOLL, D. D., General Superintendent in Königsberg, Prussia. Translated from the German, with additions by Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D. D., Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, J. FRED. M'CURDY. Together with a new version of the Psalms and Philological Notes by Rev. THOMAS J. CONANT, D. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. Royal 8vo. pp. 816.

In some respects, this is one of the most interesting volumes of Dr. Lange's great Bible work that has yet appeared in this country. The Ger-

man edition is excellent; but the American edition is better. In fact, this is the only volume of the series, so far as published in this country, that we think has been materially benefited by the American additions. But the improvements in this are very marked, and it affords us pleasure to call attention to this feature. The volume is especially rich in the department of the Homiletical and Practical. And this is as it should be, since the Psalms are particularly suggestive in matter of this kind. The addition of the new version of the Psalms by Dr. Conant adds materially to the value of the volume.

-
- 14.—*A Guide to Reading the Hebrew Text; for the Use of Beginners.* By the Rev. W. H. VIBBERT, M. A., Professor of Hebrew in the Berkeley Divinity School. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1872. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 67.

THIS is unquestionably a valuable aid to beginners in the study of Hebrew. It is not a Grammar, but a guide and a help to the reading of the text of the Hebrew Bible. It is particularly valuable in its treatment of the vowels. As one thing is given at a time, with exercises to practice, each point may be perfectly comprehended. By the aid of this little volume, it is believed that a diligent student may make rapid progress in the study of Hebrew without the help of a teacher. The work ought to be very acceptable to private students, as well as to students in colleges and theological schools.

-
- 15.—*Sermons on Living Subjects.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 12mo. pp. 468.

WHOEVER has read Dr. Bushnell's "Sermons for the New Life," will need no introduction to this volume. Still it must be confessed that the present volume does not fully meet our just expectations. True, the sermons are all characterized by Dr. Bushnell's terse and vigorous style; but they are scarcely up, in originality and importance, to many of his sermons with which we are acquainted. The volume, however, is well worth reading; and, when carefully read, can scarcely fail to stimulate religious activity.

-
- 16.—*Talks to Bereans.* By ISAAC ERRETT, Editor of *The Christian Standard*. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 190.

A NUMBER of the elementary questions of the Christian religion are discussed in this little volume with great clearness and power. The style is singularly fascinating. While it is free from any thing like dogmatism, it at once impresses the reader with the fact that the author is a man of

convictions, and is not afraid to declare the "whole counsel of God." We do not know a better book to put into the hands of those who, like the ancient Bereans, are anxious to understand the Scriptures. We hope it will secure, as it deserves, a wide circulation.

-
- 17.—*Travels in South Africa.* Compiled and arranged by BAYARD TAYLOR. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1872. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 12mo. pp. 336.

THIS addition to the "Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration, and Adventure," is both timely and valuable. Mr. Stanley's recent return from Central Africa has awakened a new interest concerning explorations in that country; and this volume will be found to contain, in a convenient form, the experiences of such travelers as Moffatt, Anderson, Livingstone, Magyar, and Stanley. The illustrations are generally spirited, while the whole is introduced by an excellent map of South Africa.

-
- 18.—*The Pennsylvania Pilgrim, and Other Poems.* By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 129.

WE need only announce this new volume by the "Quaker Poet." All true lovers of genuine poetry will heartily welcome it. The leading poem is in Mr. Whittier's best style, while the miscellaneous pieces are characterized by all the beauty and delicacy, as well as force, for which he is distinguished. Whittier is one of the poets that does not wear out, and for this reason we are glad he does not tire of writing.

-
- 19.—*The Masque of the Gods.* By BAYARD TAYLOR. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 48.

A GEM, both inside and out. A beautiful work of poetic art, but is marked by scarcely enough genius to give it immortality. It has all the finish of a master-workman, but is a little too formal to inspire the reader with a genuine enthusiasm. Mr. Taylor is growing as a poet, but has not yet reached the highest summit of Parnassus.

-
- 20.—*Pansies: "For Thoughts."* By ADELINE D. T. WHITNEY. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 111.

DELICATE and tender, with here and there a picture that will do to frame and hang up in memory.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, Professor der Theologie in Muenchen.* (Documents illustrating the Vatican Council of 1870. Collected and published by Dr. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, Professor of Theology at Munich.) Noerdlingen: C. H. Beck. 1871. 2 vols. Large 8vo. pp. 753.

THESE two volumes constitute really, in one sense, the most important work as yet issued on the subject of the Vatican Council. This Council, in all its essential parts and elements—in its immense bearings, religious, social, and political—still rises before us as a great world-event; not limited, in its origin and motives, its significance and effects, to any nation or people, but embracing the world. In the bosom of the Catholic and of the non-Catholic world, this important, far-reaching fact will remain for a long time, but especially will be to-day, a subject of ardent, profound study. It has shaken the Catholic Church to its center, and will not allow its enlightened, freer clergy and laity to remain at rest on its results. The non-Catholic world, too, affected and interested as it is in the character, the claims, and power of the Papal Church, has a great interest in studying this Church in this Council, as the great representative of what it is to-day. This Synod, therefore, as the full reflex of the Catholic Church now should be made the subject of profound study. What we want to know is this: What were the objects of this Council? What methods were adopted to secure these objects? What was its character, in its general conduct, for freedom of thought and speech, regard for Bible and history, for fairness, candor, honest dealings within itself? and what its position and utterances with regard to the liberty, rights, and enlightened progress of the world? What was the attitude of its enlightened, representative men toward these objects, methods, and general conduct of the Council? and how has the result been accepted by the men of the opposition? In fine, what is the Catholic Church of our day, and what are its aims? The world has a great, vital interest in knowing well all this; and the study of the above question will bring us to this knowledge.

But for this study we want, indispensably, the body of authoritative documents that constitute the Council's history. This these two volumes furnish us; and it is found nowhere else accessible to the world. This is the first full publication, in a collected form, of these documents.

Dr. Friedrich, the collector and writer of these volumes, is the ardent friend and coadjutor of Döllinger, at Munich. He was present at Rome as a theologian during the Council, and enjoyed, as he deserved, the estimation and confidence of a large number of its members. It was not the intention of the Council that the documents which constitute a large part of these volumes, especially the second, should ever see the light. The "protests" that were presented against the objects and the order of proceeding of the Council, the *minutes*, and many other papers that throw a somber light on the *inner* chamber of the Council, its distractions and dark ways, were never intended to see the light of day. The *secretum pontificium* was imposed on its members—a supreme law of *secrecy*, not to make any revelations of the things not to be told. Dr. Friedrich was under no such pledge. We are not surprised at the hostility excited, among the men whose souls are sold to the Pope, against the publication to the world of the inner history of the "Sacrasanct Synod."

In the Preface to the first volume, the author says:

"From many quarters, the wish has been expressed to me that I should collect and publish those documents, official or other papers, which refer to the Vatican Council of the year 1870, but have not yet been made generally accessible. And, indeed, I succeeded, while in Rome, in obtaining several papers of this class; and since my return others of importance have been furnished me from reliable sources. It is, therefore, a valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of our day which I hereby commit to the hands of the public; and, for the present, the first volume."

The publication of the first volume was met by charges on the part of those whose interests and sympathies were with the Pope and the Council, that the author could only by the abuse of confidence have secured the documents he was publishing. To this, in the Preface of the second volume, Dr. Friedrich answers:

"The materials of the first volume came into my hands, at Rome, in precisely the same manner in which they reached the bishops—either by being sent to my address or delivered to me by the distributors themselves. . . . The materials of the second volume, the official acts, however, have been regularly transmitted to me by the secretaries of the Council themselves. Very probably, those who now commend to the Catholic world the sacrifice of the understanding, and blind obedience, will take offense at the publication of documents, such as I have here made, in spite of the so-called *secretum pontificium* that was imposed on the members of the Council at Rome. On this I have only to remark, that all Christians have a good right to know the proceedings of a council whose decisions are to be binding on them; and that it is absurd to make a secret of the consultations and documents of an assembly that makes the high pretension of representing all Christendom, of being the *ecclesia congregata* in relation to the *ecclesia dispersa*."

The first volume is in five divisions: 1. *Questio*, a long paper, written by a master-hand, exposing the errors and dangers of the infallibility scheme, and circulated among the members of the Council at Rome by Bishop Ketteler, of Mainz. It breathes the strong spirit of protest of the German bishops and theologians before the meeting of the Council. Its

title indicates its burden; it is *the question* that was the only real question of Rome and the Synod. It is written in Latin. 2. *La liberté du Concile et l'Infallibilité*, of which only fifty copies were printed for distribution among the cardinals. It came from the cabinet of Darboy, Archbishop of Paris; and, if not written, was certainly inspired by him. It is a most powerful appeal and argument against the obvious purposes and methods of the Council, a terrible exposure of its weaknesses and obliquities. The spirit of that eminent man, breathing indignation at the false ways of the Papal Curia, is evident all through this document. 3. *Concio Petri Ricardi Kenrick*, Archbishop of St. Louis; of which *concio*, or speech, it is said by the author, in the *Monitum*, that it was not delivered, because discussion on the Schema of Infallibility was unexpectedly suddenly cut off. This is, perhaps, the most unsparing handling of the *questio*, and the doings of the Council in carrying it through. You can see the bold, keen Irishman in it throughout. 4. A series of *Protests* handed in to the Council by the minority bishops. This is the first time these, in completeness, in the original text, and with the signatures, have been published. They tell a story that the Pope and the infallibilists might well wish had never been told to the world. 5. *Ordo et Modus in celebratione sacri et ecumenici Concilii Tridentini observatus*. The author has published this "Order and Manner of conducting the Council of Trent," to show the difference in the conducting of the two; that the *freedom of debate, and of attendance*, of that Council was denied in this of 1870. 6. A letter of Cardinal Schwarzenberg to Antonelli, stating certain grievances, and the answer of the latter. This is an important document. 7. A *Dissertatio*, addressed to the fathers of the Council by a French priest. It treats, at great length, of a very delicate question of morals, and is to be read as a most remarkable specimen of *casuistry*, worthy of past centuries. It shows that the spirit of casuistry is not yet dead in the Catholic Church.

The second volume contains the *Schemata* and canons, with *synopses* of the discussions, as given by the secretaries or scribes of the Council, and also a number of *Petitions* and *Protests*, and other important documents. "With the exception of a few unimportant papers," Dr. Friedrich says, "these volumes contain all the official papers of the Council, as well as other productions of note connected with it."

Archbishop Darboy, of Paris, was one of the boldest and ablest opponents of the absolute power of the Pope. In his *Sententia*, delivered in the general congregation of the Council, May 20, 1870, he sets forth in six bold paragraphs—each beginning with the trenchant *certum est*—the chief and sole object—*præcipuum objectum—quodam sensu unicum*—of the calling of this Ecumenical Synod; declares that its object was *concealed* in the Bull of Convocation; and that it is impossible under the conditions to

establish any such a dogma. We can not omit giving a few passages from this able discourse:

"Nor let it be said that the unity will be closer when the central authority becomes stronger; this will not follow. It is not enough to be *one*; but that unity, and that degree of unity alone, we should rejoice in as good, which its nature and being, and the law and necessity of its life, demand. Yes, it may happen that an organization may miserably perish by the very fact that it is reduced to a closer unity; for then its internal powers are no longer able to exercise themselves and perform their vital office, being burdened, overwhelmed, and broken by the too-oppressed bond of unity. Thus, in morals, the unity of men, permitted to develop their power in liberty under law, is always freer and nobler than the unity of slaves living lazily under the arbitrary control of tyranny! Let us have the unity which is ours by Christ's institution! . . .

"Will the personal and independent infallibility arouse from their graves the extinct Churches of the African shore, or from its sleep the Orient, once illustrious with great minds and sublime virtues? Will it be easier for our brethren, the apostolic vicars, to bring the pagans, Mohammedans, and schismatics to the Catholic faith, if they teach that the Pope is in himself alone infallible? Will the proposed definition give encouragement and strength to Protestants and other heretics to come to the Roman Church, and lay aside their prejudices and hatred? . . .

"But what of Europe? I say it with sorrow, the Church is shut out from all the power and influence it once had in congresses, in public assemblies, in schools, in the family. . . . Those who control human affairs in Europe, either flee from us, or banish us from their presence.

"And what remedy is offered to the world laboring in these great afflictions of the Church? The authors of this *Schema* demand that on those who have already shaken from their undocile neck the burdens imposed of old, and venerated by the custom of the Fathers, shall be laid this new, and for that very reason, heavy and odious burden! . . . And they hope that by the definition of this personal and separate infallibility, all evils will be cured, and the faith of all will be confirmed, and their manners changed for the better!

"But they hope in vain! . . . What will an anathema avail when no one cares for the authority of him that excommunicates? Take another example. The 'Syllabus' has gone over all Europe; and what evil has been corrected, even where it was received as an infallible oracle? At that time there remained two governments in which religion flourished supreme, not only in fact, but also by right of law—I mean Austria and Spain. But in these two countries the Catholic order is going to ruin, although supported by infallible authority; yes, perhaps, and particularly in Austria, for the very reason that it is so supported.

"But it would be a long task to set forth all these things; it is impossible for me to adduce all the arguments abundant and ready at hand, and it might lead me to many things of which prudence forbids me to speak.

"I have relieved my conscience as far as I could. Accept my words, and judge of them as you deem best."

In a long and vigorous *Protestatio* against the violation of established order and usage, in proposing the question of the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, and signed by a large number of bishops, including several from the United States and the Bishop of Ermeland, now in conflict with the Cabinet of Berlin, the following passage occurs:

"It suffices us thus to have made publicly known our conviction, and we add no further entreaties; for we can no longer reconcile it with our episcopal dignity, with the office we exercise in the Council, and with the rights which belong to us as members of the Council, to make entreaties, since experience has now sufficiently, and more than sufficiently, taught

us, that such petitions will not only not be respected, but have not even been deemed worthy of an answer. Nothing else, therefore, now remains to us but to protest with indignation against the aforesaid order of proceeding, which we hold to be destructive to the Church and to the Holy Apostolical See; that we may, in this manner, relieve ourselves of all responsibility before men and in the awful judgment of God, of the disastrous consequences that will, in a short time, certainly flow from it, and are even now already flowing from it; of which this letter shall be an everlasting testimony."

The indecent outrages against all law and order respected by men, against all regard for freedom of judgment and speech, against all the light of our age; the insane persistency in carrying out the previously determined purpose, against every protest of declaring the infallibility dogma—on the part of this Council—mark it as one of the darkest spots in the history of our age, and should be the knell of doom to the Church that bows before this awful, daring insult to humanity!

These volumes record a history which men will read, and upon which they will judge the Papacy and the Romish Church.

-
- 2.—*Vortraege neber die Moral des Christenthums, im Winter, 1872, zu Leipzig gehalten.* Von Dr. CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT, Domherr des Hochstifts Meissen, Consistorialrath und Professor der Theologie. (Lectures on the Ethics of Christianity, delivered at Leipsic in the Winter of 1872. By Dr. CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT, Prebendary at Meissen, Counsellor of the Consistory, and Professor of Theology.) Leipzig. 1872. 12mo. pp. 315.

THIS book contains the third of a series of Lectures delivered by the author at Leipsic. The first course was on the "General Fundamental Truths of Christianity;" the second, on the "Saving Truths of Christianity"—that is, those truths that bring us more especially into the inner sanctuary of the Christian faith. The present course consists of ten lectures embracing, very fully, the whole range of Christian ethics. They embrace the following topics: First lecture, The Nature of Christian Ethics; second, Man; third, The Christian and the Christian Virtues; fourth, The Religious and the Ecclesiastical Life of the Christian; fifth, The Life of the Christian in Marriage; sixth, The Christian Family; seventh, The State and Christianity; eighth, The Life of the Christian in the State; ninth, The Arts of Civilization (*Kultur*) and Christianity; tenth, Refining Culture (*Humanitaet*) and Christianity. These several heads are treated as exhaustively and thoroughly as is possible within the limits of lectures. On reading the first pages, we are at once impressed with the character of these lectures—clearness, depth, patient thought, deep moral earnestness, and the strongest Christian faith. "These lectures," says the author, "are not a hasty work, but the fruit of many years' attention to the subjects and questions here treated. But I know very well that success and effect depend not on our labor, or on the time devoted to the

matter. It is our duty, it is true, to do what we can; but the best comes from above. May it have been given to me to speak of the moral truths of Christianity in such a manner as is befitting the importance and greatness of the subject, and as may redound to the good of the reader."

Of course, the discussion and development of the subject of Christian ethics, in any one or all of the questions embraced in it, are always interesting, and can never be out of place. But is there any special, loud call for such a discussion now? And what moved our author to his work? He has given us the answer in a few words. It were well for the professors, the defenders, and apostles of the Christian faith, to understand and ponder the weight of this answer:

"If ever any time demanded the discussion of these questions, it is our own. Our age, standing coldly opposed—to express it mildly—to the doctrine of Christianity, demands the moral proof of *life and acts*. And this proof is certainly always the most decisive. If Christianity can not show itself as the moral power of public and individual life, then all other proofs are of no avail. Furthermore, this proof adds new weight to all the others, and gives them their complete perfection. But if ever any thing is true, then it is this; and if ever any thing can be demonstrated, then it is this: that Christianity is not only historically, but in reality, the power and the blessing of our common national life, and an inexhaustible fountain of the moral regeneration of the nations. This has hitherto been its mission, and this mission is not yet ended. . . . May these lectures bring this to remembrance!"

It affords the highest satisfaction and encouragement to find that Dr. Luthardt has treated his questions in the clearest light of Christian truth, in the fullest harmony with its spirit, resting all his convictions on the foundation of a true faith. No poor, bald, weak, "liberal," rationalistic acceptance and interpretation of Christian truth, for so long a time so common, alas! in Germany. God speed the progress of the better day! What our author says of *sin* will reveal the ground on which he stands in this regard. All true morality, he argues, finds its real opposition in *sin*. To understand properly the former, we must, first of all, understand the latter.

"Wherein, then, consists the nature of sin?"

"Sin is not merely *sensuality*; for ambition, pride, or self-righteousness are as much sins as fleshly lust. And whether the body is dead or not, is indifferent for the dominion of sin; for sin is seated not in the body, but in the heart.

"Sin is not only a weakness of human nature, that fails to reach the end of the goal, but it is the opposite of good; and our conscience not only excuses our sins, but it condemns them.

"Sin is not only the law of our finite being; for then it would be a necessity, and have God for its author. . . . It is not only the triumph of our *freedom*, but it is the abuse of freedom; for to love God is true freedom, and obedience is the way to it. . . . 'Whosoever commits sin is the servant of sin;' this we see every day.

"It is often objected to us theologians, that we exaggerate sin in order to let the Gospel we proclaim shine the brighter on the dark gloom of this picture. It seems to me it is not at all necessary now to begin to paint sin black. The deep shadows which it has thrown into the life of men are dark enough."

"Every thing is understood by its *origin*. According to the account of the Holy Scriptures, sin had its origin in the world in the fall of the first-created. Let men judge as they may of the historical reality of this account, we can not fail to recognize the psychological insight that is found in it. There are three words which, full of meaning, appear in this narration. 'Has God said?' is the first. It shakes faith in God; this is the beginning of sin—unbelief, by which man, in his inner being, separates himself from God. 'You shall be as God'—this is the second word, a word of proud self-satisfaction; for, if God is no longer God to man, then he makes himself God, and will recognize nothing higher than himself. 'And the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good to eat, and she took of it and did eat.' This is the third word. Sin becomes the lust of the world, which makes pleasure the end of our being. These are the three steps and sides of sin: unbelief, pride, worldly lust. These three degrees and forms of sin gained historical form in three general directions of the human spirit. 'Has God really said?'—this is the word of rationalism. 'You shall be as God'—this is the word of pantheism. 'And the woman saw and ate'—this is a picture of materialism.

"The nature of sin is *selfishness*; but *the nature of virtue is love*; for this is the opposite of selfishness. Sin is the transgression of law; but love is the fulfilling of the law. This is the ideal of Christian ethics. The ideal of pagan morality is *pride*." (Pages 54-56.)

The Saxon professor—and one whose convictions and ethics rest on the Word of God—preaches a very different doctrine on the Rights, or Law, of Nations from that proclaimed by the Prussian professor, Lasson, at Berlin, in his book noticed in the July number of THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY. Lasson declares that there is no law, no rule of ethics, which a nation is under obligation to respect; its sovereign will and own interest are its supreme law; and, furthermore, that it is a crime to be a small, weak State, and that a powerful State has a right—and it may be its duty—to devour a weak one. This may be Prussian national morality. Now hear the Saxon Christian professor:

"The single States stand in relation and intercourse with each other. Greatness and smallness do not decide in this, but *right*; for not even State relations are based on might, but on right. Not even the most powerful has a right to command the weaker as a subject, but all have equal rights against each other. This is true not only of the States high in culture, but those without it. The uncivilized States are not without their right, as was the ancient view, and as many yet think; nor are the pagan nations, in the face of the Christian nations, without rights, as was the view of the mediæval system of the Popes. Christianity has taught us to regard all men and all nations as enjoying equal rights; for it has placed them all under the government of God. God has given to all—so Paul preached at Athens—their boundaries; how far are to be the limits of their habitations. Thus they are rescued from arbitrary, absolute power.

"Thus the Christian religion has become the founder of the Law of Nations. What the ante-Christian times had of international law, was limited only to a regard for certain conventional forms in the conduct of war; but the recognition of the independent rights of others, which constitutes the foundation of all international law, was wanting. This recognition Christianity first introduced among men. As it teaches men to love and serve each other, so also it preaches peace, fellowship, and mutual support to the nations."

In the same lofty, Christian spirit does the Saxon professor speak of war:

"War is the greatest curse of humanity, and the greatest crime; for it is murder on a large scale, and the destruction of the labors of peace. Certainly, it also calls into

action the good qualities, and can purify the air as a terrible thunder-storm; and may lead to progress in history. But, then, God brings also into his service sin and the passions of men. But, for that reason, sin does not cease to be sin because good *may* follow it; nor does war cease to be the unchaining of the passions of men because it is also a school for virtue; nor its work to be work of destruction because it also destroys what is evil and decayed. All the scourges of humanity are combined in war, and move in its courses; and all the woe of human life here meets. Let war be ever so fortunate and victorious, it is ever a terrible visitation, even for the conqueror. . . . Every war is a crime, when it proceeds from our own will, and is not forced upon us and made a necessity. Then only is it right, because a duty.

"Christianity entered the world with the salutation of the angel, 'Peace on earth!' and Jesus parted from his disciples with the words, 'My peace I leave with you!' And yet wars have not, since then, become any the fewer. This is not a testimony against Christianity, but a testimony against the nations."

We rejoice, also, to see that the author, in this able discussion of national and international ethics, recognizes the high office of *diplomacy*—accepting this word in its best sense—to settle in a peaceful way the strifes of nations; establishing thus the noble mission of *arbitration* in deciding international disputes, rather than appeal to the dread arbitrament of the sword. Here, too, the Saxon stands above the Prussian professor, who denies the office of arbitration, but, like the barbarian chieftain and conqueror of old, throws his sword into the scale to give weight to his side.

There is strong temptation to make copious extracts from this richly freighted book, but our space forbids. We conclude with the following pregnant passage:

"With prophetic vision to understand the world, and with kingly power to rule it—this is the mission of men on earth; and there can be none prouder. But what thus prophetically we understand and as kings make subject to us—this, together with our own selves, we are in priestly holiness to consecrate to God. This is the highest dignity of man. To serve God, is to be a lord on earth. And to unite these two things together—dominion over the earth and service to God—this is the fulfillment of our moral mission. *But this harmonizing of our earthly and our heavenly calling is the fundamental idea of the ethics of Christianity, and the truth of all other morality.*"

3.—*Ein Tag in Capernaum; erzahlt von FRANZ DELITZSCH. Zweite bereicherte Auflage.* (A Day in Capernaum; related by FRANZ DELITZSCH. Second improved Edition.) Leipzig. 1873. pp. 160.

THE object of this book, very attractive in substance and form, is stated by the author in the Preface:

"The following pages are an attempt, within the limits of a day, to give an attractive picture of the life of Jesus in Galilee. The historical realities are taken from the Gospels, but consist not only of what is there related—which, by all the means of exact exegesis and search into antiquities, is brought nearer to the understanding and the imagination—but also of many traits hitherto little observed, which are brought out by comparison, combination, and clear inference."

The author is well known as one who has devoted himself, in an unusual degree, to the study of all that pertains to the languages, the land,

the peoples, the life and scenes of the Bible—Old Testament and New—and few of our contemporaries have drunk more deeply into the spirit of Biblical life than he. The aim of the author is a most elevated, but also most difficult, one; but certainly he has succeeded in an eminent degree. By the aid of the Biblical records, profoundly studied, and the scenes and characters represented to his spirit, if possible, in the living forms in which they appeared in the days of Jesus; and by the aid, further, of the Jewish sources—Josephus, the Talmud, and Midrasch—and the representations of modern explorers of the Holy Land,—he has given us, in a most attractive picture, this “one day” in the life of Jesus in Capernaum. The Christian heart that reads this book is blessed thereby; it fills the soul with joyful reverence, love, and adoration of Jesus, the Great Redeemer.

We are convinced that much of the power and purpose of the Gospel history is lost by the superficialism and haste with which we look at and pass over them—by our failing to *represent* to ourselves the scenes and characters therein traced. Only deep, thoughtful study, resting in love and patience long over these scenes and characters, will finally bring us to this unspeakably great enjoyment. Such a book as this of Delitzsch will teach us what this is, and how to do this work. It is a work of high devotional enjoyment. Would that such books were appreciated, and more sought for! In a religious paper, we recently read a complaint that “devotional books” were not bought and read. This is no wonder; if, after the culture of mind and heart received by the people so largely from the religious press, and, we fear, even from the pulpit, there were any deep longing for devotional literature, it would be strange indeed! The endless jarring, deafening din of strife, within and without, year in and year out, kills out all hungering and thirsting for the devotional. But blessed is he that has the will and power to rescue his soul from the evil influence of this seemingly unceasing tumult, and seeks and lives a better life, as among the scenes of Jesus’ earthly pilgrimage—of his preaching to men in love; the scenes of his Divine “compassion”—of his prayers in the solitude of the “mountain apart,” the quiet vale, and olive-garden! But alas for the Christianity of those who have no thirst for such hours of devotion, but whose chief enjoyment is in the incessant clash of arms in battle with friend and foe!—who constantly, with exultation, “smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains and the shouting.”

We hope the day will speedily come when this state of things will be changed. The world will never be converted to Christ by the power of theological pugilism. We need to deal more with the heart, and more with the consciences of men. Christianity can not be successfully propagated in any other way.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

- 1.—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*. 1873. *January*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes.

THIS first-class quarterly has now entered upon its forty-sixth year. It fully retains its high eminence in German Protestant theology of the better type. Within a year, one of its editors, Dr. Hundeshagen, has passed away, and his place is supplied by Dr. Koestlin, of Halle, one of the former co-editors. Dr. Prof. Baur, of Leipzig, is added to the list of co-editors.

In the January number, the heavy articles are: The Visible and the Invisible Church, Gottschick; The Jewish Jesus-myth, Roesch (this is a review of the myths, concerning the birth and life of Jesus, invented and set afloat by Jewish malice in the first years of Christianity. These "fiery darts of the Wicked One," as the old Christian writers called them, have been often used, since their origin, by the enemies of Christ, from Celsus to our own day); Thoughts and Remarks, On some Parallel Passages of the New Testament, Michelson; The Historical Testimonies Concerning the Year of Luther's Birth, Koestlin; About Hutten's Treatise, "de Schismate extinguendo," Lindner.

There are several interesting *Recensions*.

- 2.—*Revue Chretienne*. Paris. September, October, and November.

THIS monthly, still under the able editorship of de Pressensé, is, in all respects, keeping up its character as the first journal of Protestant France. Indeed, it seems as if the extraordinary events of the last three years in France had given it a new impulse of life, and new vigor.

In spite of the unusual political, social, and religious agitations in France, the great questions that belong to the domain of quiet thought receive a full share of attention. Then the *Revue* grapples, manfully and masterly, with the living, agitated questions of religion and theology—and of present science, literature, politics, and socialism, as affecting these. It keeps its eye, in keen wakefulness, on all important events going on in the world around it. Its literary reviews, reaching in all directions, are always of peculiar interest. The important crisis (the re-establishment, after two centuries, of the *General Synod*) through which the National Protestant Church of France is passing, is giving unusual life and interest to French Protestant journalism at the present hour.

- 3.—*The British Quarterly Review*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. October.

THERE are two articles in this number worthy of special mention: Our Railway System; and, The Present Phase of Prehistoric Archæology. This last is a very valuable paper.